

## NEW JERSEY.

Charles S. Robinson to be postmaster at Princeton, in the county of Mercer and State of New Jersey.

## OHIO.

Alexander Sweeney to be postmaster at Steubenville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Ohio.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

George R. Adam to be postmaster at Brockwayville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania.

Norman K. Wiley to be postmaster at California, in the county of Washington and State of Pennsylvania.

## PORTO RICO.

Fred Leser, jr., to be postmaster at Mayaguez, in the department of Mayaguez and island of Porto Rico.

Juan Padovani to be postmaster at Guayama, in the county of Guayama, P. R.

## VIRGINIA.

Hamilton W. Kinzer to be postmaster at Front Royal, in the county of Warren and State of Virginia.

George R. Hall to be postmaster at Oconto, in the county of Oconto and State of Wisconsin.

John C. Freeman to be postmaster at New London, in the county of Waupaca and State of Wisconsin.

John C. Outhwaite to be postmaster at De Pere, in the county of Brown and State of Wisconsin.

## TREATY WITH SANTO DOMINGO.

The injunction of secrecy was removed April 6, 1906, from a report and resolutions of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation approving the pending treaty with Santo Domingo. (Ex. V, 58th Cong., 3d sess.)

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 6, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## CHRISTOPHER C. HARLAN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House from the Speaker's table the following House bill with Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 15151) granting a pension to Christopher C. Harlan.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The question was taken; and the amendments were concurred in.

## JOSEPHINE ROGERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following House bill with a Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (H. R. 8891) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Rogers.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was concurred in.

## POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. OVERSTREET, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16953—the Post-Office appropriation bill—Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has the floor for one hour.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, the railroads of this country have an inspection of watches. I do not know whether the law requires it or not, but every great railroad company has inaugurated a system of watch inspection and railroad men are required to carry the better grades of watch movements; for that reason the better grades of watch movements are called "railroad movements." This is a wise provision. The men who are responsible for the running of our trains ought to be required to carry watches that will keep the time correctly. Now, if a railroad man wants to buy the best grade of watch movement, if he wants to render the very best service he can to his employer and to the public he will feel like buying a Riverside Maximus movement. He will have considerable trouble, perhaps, in finding a place where he can buy a Riverside Maximus movement for

the minimum price at which retailers are permitted to sell them. Even the minimum price, \$60, is a large price for the average railroad man to pay. He can not find in his vicinity a small dealer who is able to carry in stock that kind of a movement, and in order to supply himself with it he must apply to the more important retail establishments, to the establishments located in the fashionable shopping districts of our cities where they have a profusion of decorative wares, where they have clerks who manicure their finger nails and wear eyeglasses and part their hair in the middle, and it costs money to run that kind of a place. He will have difficulty in buying a Riverside Maximus movement for less than \$75, because they do not sell in those places as cheaply even as the trust permits them to sell. And if he buys a Riverside Maximus movement for \$75, after assisting in paying a dividend to the trust upon all their watered stock, he is compelled to work, if he can save out of his wages a dollar a day (and he is likely to save nearer 50 cents a day than a dollar a day)—but assuming that he can save out of his wages a dollar a day, and that is an extravagant figure, he will be compelled to work for the watch trust for thirty days before he can buy this watch at the same price the laboring man over in Europe, 3,000 miles away, is able to buy it for. But he will have to work two or three weeks for the trust before he can buy this movement for the minimum price, \$60, and if he wants to buy the very cheapest movement the railroad company will probably permit him to carry—if he wants to buy a Riverside lever-setting Waltham watch, he must work at least two weeks for the watch trust after assisting in paying dividends on millions of watered stock. The laboring man in Europe, or in Canada, just across the St. Lawrence River, is able to get it without this extra effort, thanks to the beneficent effects of our protective tariff.

I have in my possession some of the export catalogues issued by the American watch trust—by the Keystone company and by the Waltham company and the rest of them. Some of them are printed in Spanish; all of them call these watches by other names than the names they are known by here in the United States. None of them quote discounts. Therefore, in an examination of this question their export catalogues are of no service. So I have brought here the watches themselves—the identical watches sold in Europe for a small fraction of the price they are sold for here to retail dealers in this country. Every watch movement is numbered—every one of them. It is easy to identify them. Every movement has stamped upon it the name of the maker. It is easy to identify them as American-made goods.

I have here a movement made by the Waltham Watch Company. This movement is known as a 16-size, 17-jewel Riverside. This identical movement was bought by a Manchester, England, watch dealer from the London office of the Waltham company for 50 shillings net, or a trifle over \$12 in American gold. This is one of the grades included in the contract the Waltham company requires dealers to execute; and before they can sell any Waltham movements they must agree to sell this movement to the consumer for \$25 or more. They can not sell for less; if they do, they forfeit their entire stock of watches. If they do, the watch trust steps in and closes up their business by shutting off their supplies; and there are dozens and dozens of retail dealers who have met with that sort of treatment from the watch trust in this country. This movement the ordinary retailer sells for about \$30. Mr. Keene advertises it for sale there at \$16.39; and no retail dealer in this country can buy it for less than \$17.35 with all discounts off.

Now, I want to give these gentlemen—the majority on the Ways and Means Committee—the number of this watch; and for their convenience I propose to put it in the RECORD. It is numbered 10537464. I challenge the Waltham company, and I do it deliberately and advisedly and with malice aforethought—I challenge the Waltham company to show by their books (and they can) whether what I have said about this movement is not the exact truth. They have opposite its number, in their books, the history of this identical watch; and I challenge them to show by their books that this watch was not sold abroad—this identical movement—for the price I say it was sold for. I challenge them to say, and to prove by their books, that Mr. Keene is not selling now this identical movement cheaper than any retail dealer in the United States can buy it. If you do not believe what I have said about it, go and inquire of any watch dealer who handles this class of goods.

I have here another Waltham movement. I want to hurry over this part of my speech. I simply want to get these into the RECORD. It is numbered 10087181. This movement is a 16 size, 17-jewel Royal Waltham. It was bought by a Manchester, England, dealer from the London office of the Waltham Watch Company for 30s. net—a trifle over \$7 in American gold. This same grade of movement costs the largest

retail dealer in America, with all discounts off, \$11.60; and Mr. Keene sells it for \$10.98—cheaper than any retail dealer can buy it from the watch trust.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RAINEY. For a question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois why he keeps on speaking of the American watch trust. I am a stockholder of the Waltham Watch Company, and know nothing of any connection with any trust.

Mr. RAINEY. The Ways and Means Committee can give the gentleman a chance to testify on that question.

I have here an O size, 16-jewel Lady Waltham, the smallest watch made for the ordinary trade. It is numbered 12016826. This identical movement was bought from the London office of the Waltham Company. I do not know what was paid for it there, but the London dealer sold it next day for 32 shillings to the agent of Mr. Keene, and was satisfied with his profit. He therefore paid considerably less than \$8 for it. This same grade of movement, with all discounts off, costs the retail dealer in this country \$10.58, and he can not buy it for any less, and Mr. Keene sells it for \$10.98.

I have here another movement which was sold abroad by the Waltham Company. This is a 16 size, 15-jewel movement, made by the Elgin National Watch Company, of Elgin, Ill. It is contained in a twenty-year Keystone James Boss brand case, made by the Keystone Watch Case Company, of Philadelphia, Pa. It sold in South America, this identical watch, for \$8.40, complete. All the Elgin movements are shipped abroad in Keystone cases, and they only go abroad in Keystone cases, and this case and the movement together was sold in South America for \$8.40. The largest retail dealer pays \$11.42 with all discounts off. This identical movement paid its way to South America, paid a commission there to a jobber, paid a commission there to a retailer, paid its way back to New York, and you can buy it in this store at 180 Broadway for \$9.78.

The movement in the watch that I now hold in my hand is numbered 7877492; it is a 16-size, 7-jewel Elgin watch, made by the Elgin Watch Company. It is in a silveroid case. The case is made by the Keystone Watch Case Company. This watch complete, movement and case, is sold to the South American trade by the Keystone Watch Case Company for \$3.04 net. The largest retail dealer in the United States pays \$4.79 for it, and Mr. Keene, after it has paid profits to two or three men, after it has paid its way to South America and back, sells it for \$4.48, and then makes a profit on it that is entirely satisfactory to him.

The movement in this watch which I now present is numbered 10925821. It is an O-size, 7-jewel Elgin watch, the smallest watch made by the Elgin company for the ordinary trade. This watch is in a five-year gold-filled Keystone case. This identical movement and this identical case were sold abroad to a London dealer for \$4.60 in American gold. The American retailer pays \$6.60 for this same grade of watch, and Mr. Keene sells it for \$6.28, cheaper than any American retail dealer can buy it. In quoting the prices American dealers are compelled to pay for all these complete watches and movements, I have quoted the price with all discounts off.

Now, I know these facts are not particularly interesting, but I am putting them in the RECORD to give gentlemen on the other side an opportunity to determine whether it is time or not to investigate this sort of thing, and whether these tariff schedules ought not now to be revised.

But we are told since last night, the information has come to us now, that there is to be a revision of the tariff.

You will all be glad to know it and the country will be glad to know it. This morning in the Washington Post is an extract from a letter written by the Speaker of the House to Col. John N. Taylor, of the Knowles, Taylor & Knowles Pottery Company, at East Liverpool, Ohio, and he announces this as the policy now of the Republican party. And if his letter is quoted correctly I am reading it correctly now:

I am satisfied there will be no tariff revision this Congress, but it goes without saying that the desire for a change which exists in the common mind will drive the Republican party, if continued in power, to a tariff revision. I do not want it, but it will come in the not distant future.

I believe the Speaker of this House told the exact truth about it.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. RAINEY. With pleasure.

Mr. SULZER. How in the world will it come if the Speaker does not want it, according to our rules?

Mr. RAINEY. It will come in the not distant future, because

the Speaker has begun to understand that the political complexion of this House is going to change. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that when it does change, there will be enough Democrats here to see that there is a tariff revision. There is no other way of accounting for this kind of a letter at this time.

Now, I want to refer to a little controversy, and anybody can verify what I say by examining the records of the custom-house in New York for the last week. Last week there arrived in New York a consignment of 2,400 American-made watches, shipped from abroad by Mr. Keene's agents there to him—American-made goods every one of them. When they reached the custom-house in New York, they were met by the agents of the watch trust; and I use the term advisedly, in spite of the fact that we have a plutocrat in this House who, by his own admission, is the holder of large blocks of stock in that trust. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They met this consignment of watches there and protested against the landing of the watches, and with their protest filed affidavits, and they made this showing: They said nearly 1,200 of those 2,400 watches had been advanced in value and improved upon while abroad by the addition of Swiss dials; and when Mr. Keene's agents investigated that statement they found that the watch trust, in order to stop his business, had duplicated a dial in Switzerland exactly the same color as the dials made in this country, exactly similar in all respects, but the words "Made in Switzerland" were stamped on the back of each one of them, and you could not find it out without removing the dials from the movements.

But there it was, a dial worth 4 or 5 cents added to the American movement in order that the American watch trust would be able to say that these identical movements had been "improved upon or advanced in value while abroad," and although less than half of this shipment had been improved in that way the officers in the custom-house at New York held up the entire shipment—the watches that remained unchanged together with the watches that had been improved upon or advanced in value by the addition of the aforesaid dials.

Mr. Keene appealed from the decision of the collector of the port of New York, and came down here, and on Friday of last week I accompanied him to the Department of Justice and to the officials of the Treasury Department and laid the matter before them, insisting that Mr. Keene had the right at least to withdraw his 1,287 watches that had not been improved upon or advanced in value, and that had been returned in identically the same condition they were in when they left this country. The officials at the Treasury Department held against us on that proposition. I am not prepared to say that they were not right about it. From their standpoint they were. There was some doubt about the question, and when there is any doubt about a question of this kind it is always resolved by Republican officials against the people and in favor of the trusts. [Applause on Democratic side.] Therefore I do not find any fault with them. They were compelled to do this. On last Saturday he paid the duty on the entire shipment of 2,400 watches, shipped the watches back to England, and took a rebate of 99 per cent of the amount of the duty paid. I could find nothing else for him to do. He gave his bond, agreeing to surrender to the customs officials his landing certificate when he gets it back from the consul at London, and thus release the bond.

He proposes now, these watches having been all shipped in the same consular invoice, to overcome this objection of the officials raised under the Dingley law and to remove from this consignment these watch movements that have not been changed in any way and to ship them back under a separate consular invoice, and then there can be no question so far as they are concerned. He proposes then to remove the Swiss dials from the other movements and ship these American-made movements back to this country in identically the same condition they were in when they went abroad. There are 1,123 of them, I believe. The watch trust has, in effect, served upon him this notice: When these 1,123 watches come back, we will meet you again at the custom-house. They have been here once before, and it may be true that they are in the same condition they were in when they first went abroad, but they have been here before, and here are the numbers on this liquidated consular invoice, and it has been held once that they are dutiable. We insist that that is res adjudicata, and you have got to pay the duty on them to get them. Upon that issue Mr. Keene's attorneys in New York City propose to make a fight, and that fight will be pending, if the watch trust makes good its threat, at the time the Congressional elections are on this fall, and you will have something else to answer for then.

Now, I understand, if anybody replies to this speech—and some of you had better reply to it—whoever replies will advance



this sort of an argument: "The Dingley tariff raises the wages of employees. It makes it possible to employ more men. It makes it possible for the business to enlarge and to increase in importance." Why, in 1880 there were twenty-seven watch factories in the United States. Now there are only thirteen.

Since 1880 the number of employees in the watch factories has increased, it is true; they employ now in the watch business—the business of manufacturing movements in this country—15 per cent more men than they employed in 1880; but they employ 600 per cent more women and 200 per cent more children. A tariff which produces this sort of result, which endangers the future of the race in this way, ought certainly to be investigated. It does not exist for the purpose of enabling watch companies to pay more money in wages to individual employees; it operates only to enable them to employ cheaper labor, to pay less money.

Now, nobody can say that these watches to which I have called attention are old-style goods, and that therefore they are shipping them abroad. That is the reason that is usually advanced. It is a great consolation to the old farmer to know that the color scheme on his cultivator has changed since last year, and for that reason he has got an out-of-date cultivator. It is a splendid consolation to him to know that the decoration on his wagon bed has changed. Last year they decorated wagon beds with roses; this year they decorate with lilies of the valley. The kind of wagon he bought last year is out of date, and for that reason they are shipping that kind abroad. If he wants to be up to date, to be a modern farmer, to farm in a scientific manner, he must buy wagons decorated not with roses, but with lilies of the valley. [Laughter.] Why, Mr. Chairman, they made watches four hundred years ago.

They made watches so small four hundred years ago that you could put one of them in the end of a lead pencil, and they can not do any better than that now. There has been no change in the style of watches; there has been nothing new in watches for four hundred years. They make them cheaper now, that is all. Over here in the National Museum they have a collection of watches presented to the Museum by Tiffany & Co., of New York, representing the various eras in the watch industry, and the watches made four hundred years ago are not very different from the watches they made last year in this country. These numbers I have given you are among the latest numbers. They are not old style goods. They can not escape responsibility on that ground.

Does the McKinley tariff have the effect of building up the watch industry? Why, certainly not. I have here an article written for the last edition of the *Encyclopedia Americana*, a signed article, written by E. A. Marsh, general superintendent of the American Waltham Watch Company, and signed by him, and I ask permission to put this in the *RECORD*. I do not want to read it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Extract from the article on watches in the *Encyclopedia Americana*.]

In conclusion, it may be said that notwithstanding the two or more centuries of priority and experience enjoyed by European watchmakers, their extreme conservatism has allowed them to be outstripped by the more progressive manufacturers of America, so that modern watch making is at the present time and in its most advanced form an exclusively American achievement.

E. A. MARSH,

General Superintendent American Waltham Watch Company.

Mr. RAINEY. Credit here is given not to the tariff, not to the men who organized the companies and watered the stock, but to the brains and intelligence and skill of the American workingman, and that is where it belongs. This article should be construed most strongly against the companies on the tariff question.

Mr. Chairman, this little watch to which I last called attention is a watch that is in demand for the holiday trade, and the Elgin company keeps it scarce in the fall in order to keep the price up. Not long ago Mr. Keene bought 2,000 of these watches from the Keystone Watch Case Company in London through an agent, and when they found out the watches were intended for shipment to the United States they refused to deliver, and Mr. Keene and the man who made the purchase for him sued the Keystone Watch Case Company, and I have here the plea they filed to their declaration in the English court. It reads as follows:

In the high court of justice, Kings bench division. 1904 K, No. 549. Between Charles Alden Keene and Maurice Michael, plaintiffs, and the Keystone Watch Case Company, defendants.

#### DEFENSE AND COUNTER CLAIM—DEFENSE.

1. The defendants admit paragraph 2 of the statement of claim. 2. The defendants were induced to enter into the said agreement in writing by the verbal representation of the plaintiff, Maurice Michael,

to the defendants made on or about the 21st day of July, 1903, that all the said watches were required for exportation to France only and not to the United States of America, and that he intended to and would export them.

3. The said representation was untrue in fact. The plaintiff, Maurice Michael, then required the said watches solely for exportation to the United States of America, and so imposed and intended to export them.

Now, I am putting in the *RECORD* the title of this case and the number of the case, and in order that you may further investigate it I want to say that the attorneys who represented Keen & Michael in this suit were the London attorneys of R. G. Dun & Co.—Dommett & Sons, of London, England, and you can write to them if you do not believe I present here a correct copy of this defense.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Has the gentleman any data showing that watches made in the United States were shipped to Europe and brought back and sold in the manner he has indicated under or during the operation of the tariff acts of 1846 or 1857, or before the civil war?

Mr. RAINEY. No; it never was done. Watches were never shipped abroad and sold for a less price than they were sold in this country until after the Dingley law went into effect. I have here a list of watch dealers in various parts of the world, from Europe, from Africa, and South America, and I charge that to each one of these watch dealers the American watch trust—the Elgin company and the Waltham company and the Keystone company and the rest of them—sell watches for a mere fraction of the price they sell to the American retailer, and I challenge them to show by their books that they do not do so, and I ask permission to put this list in the *RECORD*.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the statement the gentleman presents will be printed in the *RECORD*. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The following is the list referred to:

Mr. Evan Roberts, 30 St. Georges square, Regents Park, London; Mr. J. Blanckensee & Co., 48 Frederick street, Birmingham, England; Mr. Marcel Bourdais, 62 Rue de Tavernue, Paris; Ballantyne & Son, 52 Virginia street, Glasgow, Scotland; MM. Les Fils de Braunschweig, Chaux de Fonde, Switzerland; E. Collins & Co., 34 Pritchard, Johannesburg, Africa; George & Co., Scotland road, Liverpool, England; Hopkins & Hopkins, No. 1 Lower Sackville, Dublin, Ireland; Mr. Hurts Sendre, 6 Old China Bazaar street, Calcutta, India; Mr. Otto Heerman, 34 Ferdinand Strasse, Hamburg, Germany.

Mr. RAINEY. In 1898 they had a strike in the Elgin works, and I ask permission to put in the *RECORD*, from the Chicago Tribune, the charges made by the strikers against their employers.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has heard the request of the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection thereto? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

[Extract from page 4, Chicago Tribune, Sunday, August 28, 1898.]

#### STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCES OF EMPLOYEES.

Whereas the amount of labor required to finish and stem-fit watches is greatly increased by the poor quality and workmanship of the material furnished us; and

Whereas the price of stem fitting and finishing watches under these conditions has been cut to a point where we can not make living wages; and

Whereas we have duly made complaint of these conditions to the foreman of the finishing department and also to the superintendent of the factory, without obtaining any satisfactory consideration; and

Whereas the stem fitters have been replaced by girls, who do the work at greater expense to the company than was demanded by the stem fitters; and

Whereas we know the company has been actuated in the past by kindly feeling for its employees, which has been shown by generous and unsolicited subscriptions to the aid fund for sick and deceased operatives, and also in many other ways: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the president of the company be informed of the present unhappy condition of affairs at the factory, and see if our grievances can not be peaceably adjusted on the common ground of justice and fair dealing.

#### STATEMENT OF ONE OF THE STRIKERS.

"In order to make living wages at the scale offered by the company," one of the strikers said, "we were obliged to work so rapidly that no human being can stand the nervous tension. The most skilled finishers in the United States are unable to assemble more than forty watches a day. On one grade of movement made at Elgin a finisher would be compelled to put 100 watches together every day to make \$3—a strain that would send the most phlegmatic finisher in the country to the madhouse inside of a week if it were a physical possibility to assemble that many movements."

#### DIVIDENDS PAID IN 1893.

In 1893, when many corporations were struggling to keep from insolvency, the Elgin National Watch Company paid four dividends of 4 per cent, though to do it, the dissatisfied men declare, half of the employees were discharged and the wages of the rest were cut from 10 to 50 per cent. None of the cuts in the wage scale, the employees say, has ever been restored. When the Dingley tariff bill was before Con-

gress the Elgin Company is credited with having obtained a special duty on imported watch movements in addition to the ad valorem duty. Senator Mason, who spoke in favor of a duty, said it was a necessity to enable American watchmakers to obtain living wages. The heavy tariff went into effect, and the Elgin Company raised the price of watch movements almost to where they had been before the panic of 1893. The exact advance is not known, as the company's prices to wholesalers are trade secrets. It is known that the wholesale dealers put up the price of Elgin movements all the way from 50 cents for the cheapest to \$10 for the best movements. The employees, however, say there was no increase in wages.

Nearly two-thirds of the factory employees are women and girls. In five years improved machinery has been introduced by the Elgin mechanics that is said to be doing the work of over 200 skilled workmen, estimating by the present output of the works. Most of these machines are run by women and girls, who are paid from 60 cents to a dollar and a half a day. A skilled watchmaker acts as foreman for several of these machines. Men are found indispensable for the difficult work of assembling and timing.

Mr. RAINEY. In these charges they make they say that since the Dingley tariff went into effect the Elgin Watch Company has commenced to export their watches, that the Elgin Watch Company employ now cheaper labor, that the Elgin Watch Company employ now cheaper material, and it requires a finisher now to assemble a hundred watches of a certain kind a day in order to make \$3 a day, and in order to do that work he must lay off and rest at least two days in each week. Five days after these charges were made the Elgin Company, finding that it would not do to advertise these features of their business, settled with the striking employees, and that strike won.

Now, have I satisfied the gentlemen on the other side? Interruptions are not as frequent now as they were formerly. Have I satisfied the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAZZELL], who had so much to say yesterday about this picture I displayed here on this easel? I displayed the picture here in this room because I had a right to do it under the rules of the House, and because I obtained authority from the proper source before displaying it here.

The gentleman for so many years and with such signal ability has represented the railroads and the corporations in this body that he can not understand now how a Member can honestly and conscientiously want to represent the people [applause on the Democratic side], and he puts into the RECORD these sneering remarks. The gentleman has been a member of the school of protection graft for so long a time that he can not understand what it means for a man to have an honest motive in a matter of this kind. Have I satisfied the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY]? And for him I entertain the highest personal regard. Have I satisfied the majority leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]? I saw him yesterday circulating on that side advising Republicans to ask me no more questions. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Have I satisfied him? Are you all satisfied? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Is the gentleman a mind reader, or did he hear it, or what is he testifying about?

Mr. RAINEY. Why did they quit then; why were you going around talking to them; why did you ask no questions? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Do you propose to investigate this watch trust? Do you? The country would be glad to know it. If there is any man in this House now who believes that a tariff that can produce this sort of outrage ought not now to be revised, stand up now, my friend, here and now.

Mr. LACEY rose.

Mr. RAINEY. If there are any more, stand up, every one of you here, so the country can see you. Stand up so we can see you. All the rest of you stand up so your constituents can see you and leave you at home when the time comes to select Members for the Sixtieth Congress.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman calls for questions and then when anyone arises to ask him a question he declines—

Mr. RAINEY. I do not yield for a speech; you can make that in your own time.

Mr. LACEY (continuing). Then the gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RAINEY. I yield for a question, nothing else, as I have only five minutes.

Mr. LACEY. We will agree to give you more time. You are doing well and we will give you all the time you want.

Mr. RAINEY. Very well, I will answer your question.

Mr. LACEY. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago, in answer to the gentleman from Tennessee, that prior to the increased tariff duty there were no watches sent from the United States abroad; is that correct?

Mr. RAINEY. And sold for less—

Mr. LACEY. Or sold at any price.

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no.

Mr. RAINEY. I did not say that.

Mr. LACEY. Is it not true they were not sent abroad at any price, because they were not made here?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then why did you put on the tariff?

Mr. RAINEY. Watches have been made here for a hundred years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Before that time for two hundred years watch making was a household industry in Switzerland.

Mr. LACEY. Under this law of which the gentleman so bitterly complains is it not true that one of the greatest manufacturing in the world has been built up in your own State, and to-day a Swiss conductor on a Swiss railroad takes an Elgin watch, made in Illinois, to tell the traveler what time it is? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SULZER. And he pays less for it than the poor farmer of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. RAINEY. American watches are the best in the world, I believe.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I want to answer the gentleman from Iowa this way. My question was this: Has the gentleman from Illinois any data showing American watches were shipped to Europe and brought back to the United States under the acts of 1846 or 1857, or before the civil war, and sold cheaper to the people of the United States than they were sold originally in the United States? Now, then, on your question of tariff. Under the Democratic tariff act of 1846 the tariff on watches—gold, silver, etc.—was 10 per cent; under the act of 1857 the tariff was 8 per cent, and the war tariff of 1861 was 15 per cent; in 1862, 1863, and 1864, 20 per cent, and under the act of 1870 it was 25 per cent on watches—gold, silver, etc.

Mr. LACEY. The war tariff of 1862 was 5 per cent—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Wait a minute. Now, if there were no goods sent to Europe, why did you put a tariff on those goods at all?

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand my time is to be extended, but I do not want to take up too much time even with that understanding. I have waited in vain for some Member on the other side to intimate that there was courage enough there to revise the tariff. You are not the leaders of the Republican party, none of you, from the Speaker down to the youngest Member who sits modestly on the other side of this Hall. The real leaders of the Republican party are the McCurdys and the McCalls and the Hamiltons, the men who furnish you with the sinews of war [applause on the Democratic side]; the Rockefeller, who skulk now behind armed guards in locked castles to evade the serving of the writs issued by our courts. They are the real leaders of the Republican party; you are not. Your cowardice in this matter proves that you are not. Why, you are only the decoys these fellows place out in the pond to lure your friends to destruction. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You dare not act; I challenge you to act; I challenge you, the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, to investigate any trust in this country; to serve subpoenas upon the officials of these companies to have them produce their books before the Ways and Means Committee. You can do it and find out whether what I have said is not true. You stand behind the majority you received at the last election and feel safe. One million five hundred thousand Democrats stayed at home, and you are under the impression that you are secure.

Majorities count for nothing. Over four hundred years ago an Italian university had on its enrollment 30,000 students and in its faculty 600 professors. The faculty met, and after a stormy debate for six months—there were 600 in this faculty, and it was a bigger school than this Standard Oil college out in Chicago—and they debated for months the question, and then they solemnly decided, and they unanimously decided, that the world was flat and Columbus was a fool; but that did not make it true. A majority of the inhabitants of this globe are polytheists now. Is that any reason why we should yield to the majority and tear down our churches and build Chinese joss houses? A majority is not a safe thing to stand behind, my friends.

Ninety-four years ago the great Napoleon was advancing upon the Russian capital at the head of an army of half a million men, riding in person at the head of crushing squadrons of cavalry, with nodding plumes; in all the history of the world no such magnificent aggregation of armed men had been assembled as this. Cities had thrown open their gates; kingdoms had capitulated. He was apparently soon to become the master of the known world. His power was apparently never greater; he was apparently never more secure; but at that very moment his crushing defeat and banishment to an obscure island in the Mediterranean was less than four years away. So—for many of you, who cowardly sit here to-day and keep your mouths shut, your Waterloo and your relegation to the



rear and to the private walks of life is considerably less than four years away. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The Democratic party, fortunately, does not have any leaders. [Laughter on the Republican side.] They do not need any leaders. [Renewed laughter.] The brilliant gentleman, my friend from Mississippi, who sometimes for three or four days believes he is leading the small minority of this House, will agree with me in this proposition, and he does as well as anybody could possibly do. The Democratic party never had any leaders, and never will have any leaders, and the Democratic party does not need any leaders. [Laughter.] The man who wants to observe the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" does not need a leader. [Laughter and applause.] Every Democrat is a leader unto himself [laughter], and in its last analysis every Democratic platform and every Democratic campaign means this: "Thou shalt not steal." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We stand upon certain basic principles. We believe in the doctrine—it is never too often asserted and announced—"Equal rights to all, special privileges to none." We have emblazoned that motto in letters of fire upon the clouds, until it becomes a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night; and that is the leadership the Democratic party follows [loud applause], and no man under that kind of a leader will ever go to the penitentiary. [Laughter.] We may differ sometimes on matters of detail and party management, but we follow that leadership, and we are going in the right direction.

You are bought, every one of you, body, soul, boots, and breeches, by the trusts [laughter]; and you dare not assert the principles you really believe in. No man knows how much it costs Rockefeller, the insurance companies, and the rest of those fellows to buy you. Andy Hamilton may tell some of these days, and we will then know how many millions they had to pay for the kind of support you gave these kind of fellows.

Nobody knows except the managers of the insurance companies and their allied organizations and the managers of the Republican campaigns since 1896, and they will not tell—the men who stole the goods, and the men who received the stolen goods. The doors of our penitentiaries are opening now for every one of them. Majorities against it do not injure the Democratic party; the party stands now where it has always stood—at its post of duty. You can not defeat a party that stands for correct basic principles.

Two thousand years ago the ashes and the lava rose from Mount Vesuvius and overwhelmed two fair cities of the plain. On the walls at the gate of one of these cities stood a Roman soldier, his body incased in the iron armor of that period, holding in his hand the chain which held open the gate, and during that long and terrible night of death and despair he stood at his post of duty and held open the gate, and through the open gate thousands of men and women and children escaped to the green fields and the life and the liberty and the happiness which lay beyond.

But the ashes and the lava continued to fall, and blotted from the sight of men the ancient city of Pompeii. A thousand years passed by, and the site of that ancient city was discovered, the ashes and cinders were dug away from her streets, and there, standing on the wall, still holding in his hand the chain that held open the gates a thousand years before—standing at his post of duty—they found the old Roman soldier, his sightless eye sockets uplifted toward the stars. My friends, it does not require a thousand years for us. Already the shifting winds have blown the ashes of three great defeats from our streets, and you find the Democratic party standing where it has always stood, standing at its post of duty, still holding in its hands the chain which holds open the gates through which men, women, and children may yet escape from the dangers of the trusts, from the dangers of the protective tariff and its unrevised schedules, from all these dangers to the green fields and the life, the liberty, and the happiness that lie beyond. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and to print as an appendix to them an article which recently appeared in the Chicago Public on the subject of watches.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### APPENDIX.

##### A LESSON IN PROTECTION.

[By ex-Congressman Robert Baker. From The Public (Louis F. Post, editor), Chicago, Ill., February 10, 1906.]

If the American people are not entirely devoid of all sense of humor, then 180 Broadway will soon become as widely known as 26 Broadway.

But whereas 26 Broadway, New York, has long been an object of hatred, has embodied the very quintessence of trust wickedness, No. 180, on the same street, should personify the American spirit, the determination of the American citizen to emulate his forefathers and revolt against trust extortion.

The colossal building, 26 Broadway, which houses the numerous subsidiary companies and departments which make up the Standard Oil Company, typifies the ramifications, the strength, and the arrogance of the oil trust. The massive building seems to breathe defiance to the American people. A defiance and a warning. A defiance of all law and all restraint. A warning that whoever dares match his puny strength with that of the trust will be crushed by its remorseless despotism.

Equally does 180 Broadway personify the individual spirit; that spirit that has made America what it is; the spirit of individual determination; the spirit to do and dare; the determination to live and thrive despite the attempt of a trust to annihilate whoever will not submit to its dictation. For much as some are prone to extol bigness, it is not the great aggregations of capital that have put this country to the fore among the nations, but rather individual self-reliance, individual initiative, individual determination to achieve, no matter what the obstacles.

And the greatest evil of the trusts, in my opinion, is not their gigantic robberies, colossal as they are, but the closing up of opportunity to individual effort which inevitably results from the existence of these combinations, with their monopolistic power, to crush competition. And so I say that 180 Broadway personifies the real American spirit.

But you may ask, "In what manner, in what particular, does 180 Broadway typify the American spirit?" If there are any who do not already know it, I would say that 26 Broadway is a gigantic granite building, 14 stories high, 125 feet wide, some 250 feet deep, running through to that haven of stockbrokers, New street, and is used exclusively by the Standard Oil Company. On the other hand, 180 Broadway is a modest 25-foot building. It seems to stand as a protest against the policy of concentration going on all around it, as it is going on all over the United States, under which a constantly smaller number of people are absorbing most of the wealth produced. On the street level there is nothing to distinguish it from a score of other store fronts, as the store window, like most modern stores, is a large pane of plate glass.

But the contrast is striking in another particular. The imposing granite structure which is the home of the greediest and most ruthless of all trusts, the Standard Oil Company, that band of financial pirates dubbed by Lawson as the "system," while impressive in its massiveness, yet lacks the attractive element. One hundred and eighty Broadway, on the other hand, while itself an unimposing building, yet possesses a distinct attractive power. While none but the agents and satellites of the monopoly, and those compelled to do its bidding, ascend the steps at 26 Broadway, hundreds of the city's population eagerly enter the other, while scores of people are ever congregated in front of the store. Why this contrast? It may be asked. The answer is simple. Where 26 Broadway is the home of "addition, division, and silence," and all who enter must swear eternal fealty and secrecy, 180 can only thrive through publicity and open and above-board dealing. The oil trust has fear and necessity for its servants; all who do business with it had better keep mum as to what they learn; but the other building derives its popularity because it is the head center of a contest against monopoly.

Its power to attract lies in the fact that behind that large plate-glass window is spread out the conclusive proof of the falsity of the claim that the "system," misnamed "protection," really benefits the worker, in whose interest it is said to be established.

In that store window is displayed, in case upon case, the indisputable proof that human beings can not be trusted with unrestrained power; that such power will almost certainly be used solely for their own aggrandizement and enrichment, and not for the benefit of those in whose interest it is claimed to be conferred, and for whom those entrusted with the power are supposed to merely act as agents.

That these agents are vociferous in asserting that they ask for the power to tax simply that they may convey the benefit to others does not alter the case. The power to tax being theirs, they use it not to raise wages to employees, but to create fortunes for employers; not to expand production, but to restrict it by extortionate prices.

At 180 Broadway an enterprising American merchant presents the proof that his fellow-citizens are victims of a gigantic flim-flam game, that the people are playing with those who hold loaded dice, the dice being labeled "protection." Because that word implies a spirit of beneficence, those who hold the loaded dice are able to fool the American people into the idea that in some mysterious manner they are its beneficiaries, whereas they are really its victims.

In this store window are displayed hundreds and hundreds of watches (American) which have been exported and sold abroad at such large reductions from the home price that this watch dealer, Charles A. Keene, is able to maintain agents in England, Germany, and other European countries—yes, even in Egypt—to purchase these American watches, express them back to the United States, and, after paying all expenses for commissions, express and insurance charges, is then able to undersell other dealers in the same identical goods, who buy their watches direct from the watch trust, by from 25 to 50 per cent.

Having before their own eyes this convincing evidence of the fraud that is practiced upon them in the contention of the watch trust that a tariff on watches is necessary to prevent them from being driven out of business by foreign watch manufacturers—the very foreigners whom they are underselling in Europe—is it surprising that those who have heard of the fraud should make a pilgrimage to that store to see for themselves, and that there should always be a struggling, pushing crowd eager to examine the proof of this robbery in the name of "protection?"

Nor is it surprising that this enterprising and courageous Yankee (courageous in thus throwing down the gauge of battle to a wealthy trust) should at times find his store inadequate to accommodate those who are so foolish as to desire to obtain an American watch at from 60 to 75 per cent of the price his neighbor has paid for a similar timepiece made in the same factory (i. e., by either the Waltham or Elgin companies, who compose the trust), but which has not made a trip to Europe.

There is no possibility of the purchasers being deceived. Every one of these watches has made the European trip, is numbered and stamped with the name, either Waltham or Elgin. In order, however, that the skeptical, or even the most timid, may be relieved of any possible doubt of the absolute reliability of these watches—as to their being the standard make and that they are not old goods, but that they are of the

latest designs—this man, Charles A. Keene, who has thus circumvented the trust, gives to each purchaser a written guaranty that it is in all respects as represented, agreeing to return the purchase price if any dealer to whom the purchaser may submit the watch will say that it is not a genuine Waltham or Elgin of the latest manufacture and of the grade as represented.

It is perhaps too much to expect that, with so many other phases of the trust question engrossing public thought, the name of the American who defies and harasses the watch trust will become a household word, but if posterity is to accord fame in proportion to the effectiveness of the blows each of us may deliver against trust extortions, then the name of Charles A. Keene will surely be associated with the fight against an arrogant monopoly—the watch trust.

Whether "Keene is," as a newspaper has said, "an effective trust buster," or not, certainly he has shown that he is not merely Keene by name, but keen by nature, for in reimporting their own watches and selling them in competition with their own agents at from a quarter to a half less than they are sold for almost next door, he hits the trust a solar plexus blow. Keene is evidently an American who is alive to his opportunities; one who is not deterred from going straight to the mark by any threats of the trust that "they will put him out of business," and "will not permit him to get any watches to sell." Fortunately, he is endowed with that indomitable grit which is characteristic of his race, and he has not been bluffed, cajoled, or frightened. This case is but another illustration of how little one knows in this big city of what his neighbor is doing.

It seems that Mr. Keene has reimported and sold thousands of these watches during the past year, and yet it was only a few days ago that I learned about it; and I find that a similar ignorance of the matter existed among my friends, although some pass the store almost daily, but then a crowd no longer attracts a permanent New Yorker.

Keene distinctly disclaims being a philanthropist. He says he is merely following that immutable law which governs the actions of men, which leads them to gratify their desires with the least exertion.

Having figured out, (and subsequently proved) that there was more money to be made by defying the trust than in acceding to its demands, and having the necessary grit, he proceeded to defy it. For the watch trust follows the practice of other monopolistic combinations—it exacts a written pledge from the dealers that they will not sell to customers at less than certain stipulated prices. The pledge is cast iron and copper riveted, and woe betide the dealer who dares break it by selling his watches at less than list prices.

Fourth of July orators tell us that this is a Republic, that freedom reigns, and that we are sovereign citizens. And yet this proves that thousands of watch dealers all over the country are really nothing more than the hired servants of the watch trust. It is true that their names are emblazoned on store windows and over doors. But in order to reveal the condition of servitude that exists—the real relation existing between the watch trust and retailers of watches—their signs should read, not—

"William Jones, watch dealer and jeweler."

But—

"William Jones, employee of the watch trust."

No wonder that when Keene hoists the trust with its own petard that it squirms, fumes, and threatens him with the most dreadful penalties if he does not desist from buying their own goods (abroad) and retailing them at from 30 to 50 per cent less than they permit American retailers to sell them for.

Presumably the trust's wits have been sharpened by Keene, but they have not yet devised a plan to prevent his continuance of what, for his customers at least, is a philanthropic act.

As an illustration: The most expensive watch made by the Waltham Watch Company is the grade known as "Riverside Maximus." The usual price at retail is \$75. American dealers have to enter into an ironclad agreement not to sell for less than \$60. Keene buys this watch abroad, pays all expenses, commissions, express, and insurance charges, and yet is able to sell it at retail for \$42.30 and still make a legitimate profit.

He tells me this holds true as to practically all other grades of watches, about the same proportionate reduction of price being made all through. He is even able to reimport an American Waltham watch and retail it for \$2.98.

Surely this is a lesson in protection for the American people.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I also ask permission to print in the Record a small cut of this picture which I have used in illustrating my speech, and to furnish the cut at my own expense.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LACEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask whether this is a proposition to insert this cut-rate diamond advertisement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. LACEY. I understand it is a proposition to insert this advertisement of cut-rate diamonds in New York City in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RAINEY. No, sir; to insert the picture that I have used in illustrating my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. To insert the identical picture which is exhibited in front of the desk, only on a smaller scale.

Mr. LACEY. I understand the firm that it advertises will pay for the cut.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether this has ever been permitted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to inform the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I can inform him. It has been done half a dozen times since I have been in Congress.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I shall make no objection, if there ever has been a picture printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD illus-

trating a Member's remarks; but if this is the first instance of it, I think we ought to prevent the starting of a precedent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It has been done repeatedly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Maps and everything.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I am simply inquiring whether a cut which clearly shows an advertisement of an individual has ever been printed as a part of a gentleman's remarks? I am not questioning the point which the gentleman has made, but nevertheless this is clearly advertisement, and I inquire whether it has ever been done?

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, one question.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask it as a matter of right, then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Suppose the name is stricken out, and only the words left, "Cheaper than in America."

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield for this question?

Mr. OVERSTREET. Of whom and what about?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose the name of the dealer is stricken out and only the words left "Cheaper than in America;" would you still object?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana did not object. The objection came from another source.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I ask for the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. RAINEY. I rise to a question of privilege. I insist I have the right to put this picture in the Record under the rules of this House at my own expense.

The CHAIRMAN. That is something that will come up later. The Chair does not have to pass upon it now.

Mr. RAINEY. I submit it now. It is time for this speech to go to the printer.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I object.

Mr. RAINEY. I move that I be permitted to print this picture in the Record with my speech at my own expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not recognized for that; and, in the second place, the Committee of the Whole has not control of that matter, but the House.

Mr. RAINEY. Then I will submit my motion to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has not the floor. The gentleman from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. OVERSTREET. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] does not desire to occupy some time, I will yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, the pending measure is of more interest to the people of this country than any other appropriation bill that will come before this House. I regret exceedingly that, in its consideration of this bill, the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads did not see fit to include a provision increasing the salaries of letter carriers to \$1,200 per annum. I am advised that at the proper time an amendment to the pending measure will be introduced, fixing the salaries of carriers in all cities where the population exceeds 250,000 people to the amount above indicated. I bespeak for this amendment, when introduced, your very careful consideration.

It will affect the carriers in the post-offices at New York, Chicago, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, St. Louis, Boston, Baltimore, Cleveland, Buffalo, San Francisco, Cincinnati, Pittsburg, New Orleans, Detroit, Milwaukee, and Washington.

I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments so that I may lay before you the reasons why, in my judgment, this amendment when offered should be adopted.

I propose to discuss the proposition from the standpoint of New York and Brooklyn. There during the past ten years rents and living expenses have increased 30 per cent. The employees in the State and municipality have had their salaries increased accordingly. We pay our police officers and firemen \$1,400 per annum. Ten years ago they received \$1,000. Our inspectors of health, tenements, water, and buildings are all paid from \$1,200 to \$1,500 per annum. The cleaners and laborers in our public buildings are paid \$900 per annum, while the letter carrier, appointed after a most rigid examination and barred by the rules of the Post-Office Department from further promotion, and possessing the highest state of intelligence, receives the maximum salary of \$1,000 per annum, or \$19 per week. Out of this sum he is compelled to purchase two complete uniforms each year, and is not paid when he is ill. Mr. Chairman, ten years ago in New York City the carpenter was paid \$3 per day; now he receives \$4.50. The bricklayer, plasterer, and plumber were paid \$4 per day; now they receive \$5.50 per day; and so I might enumerate all of the trades. The hod carriers to-day receive \$3.25 a day, as against \$2.50 a day ten years ago. The motor-men and conductors on the street railways receive \$2.40 per



day, which is an increase of 20 per cent. The people employed in our factories and stores are receiving an average of 15 per cent more in salaries than they received ten years ago, while the letter carrier, as regular as the clock, trudges along, in all sorts of weather, not only working six days a week, but compelled to spend three or four hours at the post-office on Sunday preparing his work for the next day, and in the busy seasons, when the mail is heavy, not only works from twelve to sixteen hours a day without complaint, but at Easter, election time, Christmas, and New Year is often compelled to hire a horse and wagon to carry his bulky mail, for which expenditure the Government makes no allowance.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. CALDER. I will.

Mr. SULZER. Does not the gentleman from New York know that I have introduced a bill at the request of the letter carriers of the United States in the last five Congresses to graduate their pay so that they will get enough to live on decently and be able to procure the necessities of life for themselves and their families; and does not the gentleman know that the Republican Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads of this House has refused for five successive Congresses to report this letter-carriers' bill?

Mr. CALDER. I know that the gentleman from New York has introduced a bill in this Congress. I do not know what he has done before, and I do not know the reasons why the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads has refused to report the measure.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. I understood the gentleman to say that the letter carriers labor from twelve to fourteen hours a day?

Mr. CALDER. During certain busy seasons.

Mr. HEPBURN. I want to know if there is not a post-office regulation that compels them to suspend their labor after eight hours, even though they may be in the midst of a delivery?

Mr. SULZER. That is not a post-office regulation; it is the law.

Mr. HEPBURN. And they are not under any circumstances allowed to labor more than eight hours?

Mr. CALDER. The statement of the gentleman from Iowa is undoubtedly true, but I know of some instances where letter carriers in Brooklyn work more than eight hours a day through the busy seasons of the year.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that there is no class of men in the Government employ more deserving. They are compelled because of the exacting character of the work to live near the post-offices in the heart of our great cities, and because of high rents are obliged in some instances to live in crowded tenements, while struggling to bring up their families and educate their children in a respectable manner.

Mr. Chairman, this country is enjoying a great era of prosperity; the workmen, the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, and the professional man are all doing well; property throughout this great land has increased in value and the country is growing richer each day. I ask that these men receive their just due, and that when this amendment is offered it may have the approval of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, we who believe that the use of tax-free alcohol, made undrinkable by denaturization, will work a vast change in the source of fuel, light, and power are charged with being fanciful in our hopes. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit we are no more fanciful in our hopes than the Congress is fanciful in its tenacious fealty to precedent.

Take our magnificent postal system, which has just been under discussion. Complete as the system is, it has some regulations which are as strange as they are old. A hundred years or so ago Postmaster-General Meigs, the good old soul, ruled books out of the mail because the sharp corners rubbed the addresses off of envelopes. It is a tribute to our spirit of progress that this provision does not survive. Along about the same time, however, the 80-rod provision got into the system. This regulation provided that where a new post-office was created within 80 rods of the established route the stagecoach should not charge anything extra for making the detour and delivering the mail thereto. Long ago the stagecoach passed. The railroad has come, but we still cling fondly, affectionately, to that 80-rod provision, and while the locomotive can not make the detour we make the railroads deliver the mail when the post-office is

within 80 rods of the station, while we deliver it ourselves if the post-office is 85 rods away. Apparently the provision is as firmly fixed with us as the "M" in our coat lapels, originally put there as a sign of recognition by a French Revolution society; as firmly fixed as the two buttons on the back of our coats, put there four or five hundred years ago to hold up sword belts.

Akin to this has been the national attitude toward undrinkable alcohol. The internal-revenue tax on drinkable alcohol is levied by all civilized governments, but we are the one great nation left which continues to tax that alcohol which is not drinkable. Some of us believe that if the tax is taken off the undrinkable alcohol it will work eventually a revolution in the field of fuel, power, and illuminants. We believe this will be accomplished partially through known methods, but that the greater development will come through as yet undiscovered methods.

For there is no industrial avenue closed to the open sesame of American genius. By known methods the same volume of alcohol burns nearly twice as long as kerosene and gives a far better light; it is a cleaner and better fuel than gasoline. By the methods that are to come, I believe it will advance far beyond its present superiority.

#### INDUSTRIAL ALCOHOL IN LEASH.

Why? Because this country, the chief producer of corn, the best source of alcohol, has for nearly fifty years held burnable alcohol in leash. In those fifty years all other chemical products and fuels and illuminants have been free. Burnable alcohol, for industrial use, has been held back. Release it, and it will open the door to a chamber of marvels; not in a day, to be sure, but certainly as its use gradually develops.

We who are fanciful can not forget the story of the past. About the time that good old General Meigs was ruling books out of the mail, there passed through the city of Washington, in a stage coach, a man and a woman who were to revolutionize, between them, one of the products of the world. One was the widow of General Greene of the Revolution; the other an ingenious young Yankee from Massachusetts, Eli Whitney by name. Whitney had secured a place as private tutor in a family in Savannah.

Mr. HIGGINS. Give Connecticut credit. Whitney was from Connecticut.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right. He did belong to Connecticut. Mrs. Greene was returning to her home in that city. When they reached Savannah, the two had become acquainted. Eli found that another man had his job. He was in a strange city without money. Mrs. Greene asked him to be her guest until he found work. While he was waiting, Eli one day saw Mrs. Greene working some embroidery on a tambour frame. This tambour frame was so constructed that it impaired and impeded the work. "I can fix that," said Eli, and he at once tinkered into shape a new tambour frame which obviated all difficulties. Out of that little tambour frame, Mr. Chairman, sprang all the prosperity of the South. For a few nights later Mrs. Greene gave a party. One of the gentlemen of the old South, when the conversation turned to cotton, said in lamentation, "The South produces but 5,000 bales of cotton a year. If there was some way in which we could get the cotton away from the seed cheaply, we would produce hundreds of thousands of bales, and we would all be prosperous."

Perhaps the company thought the gentleman fanciful. But not so the good Mrs. Green, for she said: "If you want a machine that will take the cotton from the seed, I've the Yankee boy upstairs who can make it for you. Why, see here, he made me this tambour frame." And she brought Eli down. He had never seen any raw cotton. Some one went to a warehouse and brought him a handful. And the next morning in the basement of the Green mansion he went to work and soon built the first cotton engine, which the darkies abbreviated to gin, the gin which makes the South's 13,000,000 bales possible to-day.

#### THE STORY OF GOODYEAR.

Nor can we who are fanciful forget Goodyear, who came out of a debtor's prison in Philadelphia to give the world vulcanized rubber. I think it was in Andrew Jackson's Administration that this country went crazy over rubber. Rubber companies capitalized to the amount of \$5,000,000 were formed. Rubber boots, coats, and shawls were made. But the first ensuing summer was a hot one, and those boots and shawls melted. It was a common sight in those days, it is said, to see a man in the backyard burying his boots to get rid of the smell. Bankruptcy overwhelmed the rubber business. Meanwhile Goodyear, on Long Island, was working to discover a treatment which would make the rubber heat resisting. He found it, but no one would listen to him. They had enough of rubber. Goodyear made an

individual campaign in favor of his discovery. He dressed in rubber and paraded the streets of New York. Once a man from Boston visited New York to see Goodyear, and asked the hotel clerk how he could find him. "Go out on the street," the clerk replied, "and when you meet a man wearing rubber breeches, a rubber coat, a rubber hat, and a rubber shirt, and carrying a rubber purse without a blessed penny in it, that's Goodyear."

But Goodyear finally won, and our immense rubber production is the result.

We who are fanciful believe that denatured alcohol, with known inventions, will gradually take its place in the market with other illuminants and fuels, and with inventions that are to come, that it may ultimately dominate many portions of the market.

#### FOUR KINDS OF ALCOHOL.

There are four kinds of alcohol to which I desire to call your attention.

The first is ethyl alcohol, made principally from grain. This is the drinkable alcohol. From 1896 to 1905 the cost of making it from corn varied from 9 cents for 190 proof to 19 cents, this variation being because of the price of corn. There are two common measures of ethyl alcohol—one the proof gallon, which is 50 per cent alcohol, 50 per cent water; the other the 190 proof gallon, which is practically pure alcohol. The latter is that used for light and fuel. This Government places a tax of \$1.10 on each proof gallon and \$2.09 on each 190 proof gallon. No one proposes to take this tax off drinkable alcohol, or to disturb it.

The second is methyl alcohol, or wood alcohol. It is made from the smoke and fumes of charcoal, and is a by-product of that article together with acetate of lime. It costs to make it about 39 cents a gallon. It sells from 60 cents to \$1.50, according to the degree to which it has been refined. It is now brought to a very high state, and has largely supplanted grain alcohol in manufacture. It is a poison. It is not taxed.

The third is denatured alcohol. This is a mixture of grain alcohol and wood alcohol, used extensively in many lines in other countries, but not in the United States. The usual mixture is 10 to 15 parts of wood alcohol, the denaturant, to 100 parts of grain alcohol. It is poison.

The fourth is mineralized denatured alcohol. This is a mixture of grain alcohol, wood alcohol, pyridine (a coal-tar product), and green malachite, and is used in France and other countries as fuel and illuminant. The mixture in France is 2 parts of wood alcohol, one-half part of pyridine, to 100 parts of ethyl alcohol, with a small part of malachite added. The wood alcohol poisons the ethyl alcohol, the pyridine makes it noxious so that it would vomit anyone who should drink it, and the malachite colors it green to prevent anyone taking it by mistake.

In Germany, Sweden, France, Italy, England, and Russia, and Belgium, in Chili, Brazil, Venezuela, Mexico, in fact in nearly every nation except the United States, there is no tax on denatured alcohol.

The proposition before the Congress is to take the tax off alcohol which has been denatured and thus rendered unfit for drinking or for use in liquid medicines. Extensive hearings on the subject have been given by the Ways and Means Committee, and that committee has prepared a bill and introduced it. I hope it will pass this body and the Senate this session.

#### PRICE OF CORN AND ALCOHOL.

The first of the alcohols I have enumerated, ethyl alcohol, is made from anything containing quantities of starch and sugar. Corn heads the list, yielding 75 per cent of alcohol. Potatoes yield 15 per cent, and are chiefly used in Germany. Our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, believes that a large potato will be produced here for alcohol purposes if we take the tax off denatured alcohol. As sweet potatoes, sugar canes, cassava, and sugar beets all yield alcohol, every part of the country can produce its own fuel and light. Of this ethyl alcohol the United States produced 128,623,402 proof gallons in 1902; Germany the same year produced 223,899,120 proof gallons. Of this amount Germany used 73,635,249 gallons in the arts, free of tax.

Whether or not small cooperative distilleries in farm neighborhoods would develop in this country for the production of fuel and illuminant, I am not competent to say. Such an evolution is possible and would bring with it the utilization of much of the unmarketable farm product, save transportation of the stock-feed residue from the still, and eliminate the freight charge on the raw corn to the distant distillery and the freight charge on the fuel and illuminant from the distillery to the farm. Germany has a vast number of these small distilleries. So has Belgium, but in the latter country, where distilleries

putting out as little as 250 gallons per day are permitted, the small concerns have a hard struggle to live against the large distilleries and their economies. As a rule the American farmer does not divide his interest and does not manufacture, and if I should hazard a guess, I would say that the farmer will buy his fuel alcohol from an independent distiller. Of course all such distilleries will be under strict governmental supervision.

Using corn as the raw material, the average yield of alcohol from a bushel of corn is nearly 5 proof gallons, equaling 2½ gallons of absolute or pure alcohol, or 2.66 gallons testing 94 per cent. The by-products, used for feeding cattle, pay the cost of distillation. Alcohol, then, can be produced as follows: Corn, at 30 cents per bushel, would produce 94 per cent alcohol, at 11 cents; corn, at 35 cents per bushel, would produce 94 per cent alcohol, at 13 cents; corn, at 40 cents per bushel, would produce 94 per cent alcohol, at 15 cents. This would bring the estimated cost of fuel alcohol, denatured for fuel and light, to the consumer as follows:

Cost of grain alcohol, at, say, 14 cents per gallon	Cents.
Cost of denaturant, at 60 cents per gallon	14
Package and selling profit per gallon	13
Total	4
	191

This is a very conservative figure. No doubt it will be made at a price below that. But considering the fact that because only 2 per cent of petroleum is gasoline and by reason of the great increase in gasoline engines used this gasoline is constantly increasing in price, 20 cent alcohol, which gives twice the length of burning and is a better light than kerosene and is a cleaner and less dangerous fuel than gasoline, will occupy the field as a regulating competitor of the products of petroleum, now in rural districts a monopoly.

#### THE HISTORY OF KEROSENE.

This brings me to the consumption of petroleum fuel and light in this country to-day. The kerosene lamp is only fifty years old. Mr. Kier, of Pittsburg, brought the first glass chimney to America and produced the first kerosene lamp. Kier was another Whitney, another Goodyear. He made the present immense production of petroleum possible by his lamp. My father told me the other day that when he was a boy petroleum was used solely as a healing ointment and was called Seneca oil. To-day, according to the census of 1900, we use in the United States in the neighborhood of 534,000,000 gallons of kerosene annually as an illuminant. We are using about 280,000,000 gallons of gasoline of domestic production, or altogether about 800,000,000 gallons of kerosene and gasoline. My State, Kansas, uses annually 9,000,000 gallons of kerosene and 6,000,000 gallons of gasoline. This tremendous market is held by a monopoly. What will be the effect if tax-free denatured alcohol is let into this field?

#### USE OF ALCOHOL IN MANUFACTURES.

Those who charge us with being fanciful, to begin with, do not deny that great good will come to the manufacturers by taking the tax off denatured alcohol. They will pay a low price for an alcohol which does not injure the workmen, as wood alcohol does, where they are now paying from 70 cents to \$1.50 for wood alcohol. The manufacturers who will use this product are those making aniline colors and dyes, hats (stiff, silk, and straw), electrical apparatus, transparent soap, furniture, picture moldings, burial caskets, cabinetwork, passenger cars, pianos, organs, whips, toys, rattan goods, lead pencils, brushes, wagons, boots and shoes, smokeless powder, fulminate of mercury, brass beds, gas and electric light fixtures, various kinds of metal hardware, incandescent mantles, photographic materials, celluloid and other like compounds, sulphuric ether, organic chemicals. Artificial silk, not now made in this country, will be made and will consume hundreds of thousands of bales of cotton. It is no part of the plan of this legislation to remove the tax from spirits used in patent medicines or chemicals. The fact that it will benefit the manufacturers conceded, will it benefit the farmer; and if so, how? I would answer, in three ways:

First. By increasing the market demand for corn. As we produce some 2,000,000,000 bushels of corn annually, the increased demand of some 100,000,000 bushels of corn for alcohol would not seem to have a material bearing on the price; but, nevertheless, this increased demand would come out of the surplus production, which has a disproportionate weight in reducing the price, and in years of short production this increased demand would have a greater effect on raising the price.

Second. By regulating the present erratic price of kerosene and gasoline. This would no doubt be denatured alcohol's most important function. Gasoline sells in some of the eastern cities at 9 cents a gallon; in some of the Western States at 30 cents



a gallon. Kerosene has a similar range. The price is fixed arbitrarily by the Standard Oil trust. Actual tests have demonstrated that alcohol at 30 cents a gallon is cheaper than kerosene at 15 cents a gallon. Twenty-cent alcohol would drive 10-cent kerosene down in price or out of the market. For internal-combustion engines 20-cent alcohol would bring 30-cent gasoline to 20 cents, and would perhaps in time supplant it, because gasoline, apparently from natural causes, is increasing in price.

Third. By the general use of denatured alcohol for fuel, light, and power in rural districts. This brings me to a description of the alcohol light, the alcohol engine, and the alcohol refrigerator.

Mr. SIMS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. In using alcohol you avoid the unpleasant odors and fumes that you get from the use of gasoline, do you not?

Mr. MURDOCK. Absolutely; it is not foul smelling.

Mr. SIBLEY. Will the gentleman pardon me an interruption?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. SIBLEY. I did not hear the gentleman state what price alcohol could be furnished to the consumer.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have stated, but I will state it again, that at one of the Peoria distilleries from 1896 to 1905 the cost of alcohol 190 proof, or 90 above proof, averaged from 9 cents to 19 cents a gallon.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman state what was the price of corn at that time?

Mr. MURDOCK. Corn varied from 30 cents up to 65 cents a bushel.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that in the western part of the State, or farther west, where he and some of the rest of us live, the price of alcohol made out of corn, that is much cheaper than the price which he refers to, would reduce the cost of alcohol perceptibly.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is perfectly true, but because I have been accused of being fanciful I have tried to be conservative by taking the higher figures.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. Can not you produce alcohol about as good as the grain alcohol from other substances, like cornstalks, beets, refuse matter, and things of that kind, at an infinitely small price, and from useless substances that are now of no practical service to anybody?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true, and I have left that out of consideration and dealt wholly with the corn. The residue of the sugar beets, molasses from sugar cane, cassava, yams, and Irish potatoes will all produce alcohol. Germany's alcohol, with a production of 223,000,000 gallons against our 128,000,000 gallons, is produced from potatoes.

Mr. FULKERSON. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. FULKERSON. How does the power produced by gasoline compare with that produced by alcohol?

Mr. MURDOCK. I have stated that the power produced by gasoline and alcohol is about the same, with a slight advantage in favor of alcohol.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am in favor of taking off the tax on alcohol in the use of the arts. One of the most beneficial things the Ways and Means Committee has done for a long time is to report this bill favorably. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that I concur in substance with the eloquent remarks the gentleman has made, and I suggest to the gentleman that he apply, in order to bring about the consummation so devoutly to be desired, to the source of all power in the House of Representatives—the Committee on Rules—and have that committee bring in a special rule to consider this bill; and I undertake to say that if the Committee on Rules will bring in such a rule for the consideration of this measure, we will be able to pass it.

Mr. MURDOCK. While, as a rule, I am against rules, for this very commendable purpose I think I should stand for the rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman please state the price of gasoline?

Mr. MURDOCK. The price of gasoline varies over the country. It is said that it sells here for automobile purposes for 9 cents a gallon. It sells in the West for 28 cents a gallon. There are territories in the United States in which it sells at 30 cents a gallon.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would state that I would like to correct the gentleman about the gasoline selling here for 9 cents a gallon. I am buying it every day in a small

way. I pay 15 cents a gallon for it, and at some places they charge as high as 20 cents a gallon. At home I pay 22 cents a gallon for it in barrel lots. I have a letter here from Texas that tells me it is selling there for 30 cents a gallon.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Sims] that the first function of denatured tax-free alcohol, in my opinion, would be to compete and as a competing regulator with gasoline and kerosene.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. I understand the gentleman to say that if we take the tax off alcohol it will be a competitor with kerosene. Is that so?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. SULZER. Then of course we are to assume that the trust of all trusts—the Standard Oil trust—is opposed to taking this tax off alcohol.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should think they would be, but I was not discussing that feature of the case.

#### THE ALCOHOL LAMP.

Both Professor Wiley, of the Department of Agriculture, and Rufus F. Herrick, representing the American Chemical Society, exhibited alcohol lamps before the Committee on Ways and Means. The lamp Mr. Herrick showed was of French make, price about \$2. The burner, which is the vital part of the lamp, costs about \$1, and is interchangeable with any ordinary kerosene burner. It is a vapor light. The alcohol is drawn up by capillary attraction to a point where it comes to a tube which has a hair-like orifice, which, being warmed, converts the alcohol into vapor, and which then rises through a perforated plate and by the white heat of the mantle is turned into gas. The resulting light is very brilliant, but can be regulated. It is clean and safe. Speaking of the lamp in comparison with kerosene lamps, Mr. Herrick said:

I want to refer, in connection with this lamp, to the report made by the Electrical Testing Laboratories in New York City, and to state that 1 gallon of alcohol burned fifty-eight hours and fifty-two minutes, the candlepower of the lamp being twenty-five and the candlepower hours being one thousand four hundred and seventy-one. In a lamp burning kerosene 1 gallon lasted eighty-seven hours, the candlepower of the lamp being nine and the candlepower hours being seven hundred and eighty-three.

The report is signed by the Electrical Testing Laboratories, by Preston D. Miller. I submit that this report shows that if we had two lamps of equal capacity, one burning alcohol and the other kerosene, the alcohol lamp would burn nearly twice as long as the kerosene lamp. I have read a report of experiments conducted for an extended period by Professor Rosseau, of the University of Brussels, Belgium, in which careful photometric tests were made of both alcohol and kerosene burning lights. This report showed that for lighting purposes alcohol costing 31 cents per gallon is slightly cheaper than kerosene costing 15 cents a gallon.

These lights are used in Germany and France. The Emperor's palace in Berlin is lighted with alcohol. No one claims that the alcohol lamp will entirely supplant the kerosene lamp, but it will become its rival in time.

#### THE ALCOHOL ENGINE.

Prefatory to a statement on the use of alcohol for power, something is to be said about the conquering march of the internal-combustion engine through the land. Light in weight, small in size, easy to start, requiring a minimum of attendance while in operation, it is everywhere bringing new economies, is everywhere making the sweat of industry's brow a poetical figure of speech. Its irregular snort, its asthmatic cough is abroad in the land, and as the walls of Jericho crumbled at Joshua's horn, so, at its sound, the back-breaking, arm-wearying, brain-benumbing hardships of small shop and farm are vanishing. It turns the weekly newspaper press, the town feed mill, the sausage grinder of the local butcher, the lathe of the village blacksmith, the belts of the local elevator, and in some sections it bales the farmer's hay, shells his corn, shreds the fodder, pumps the water, separates the cream, saws the wood, and last, but not least, it is marching on to the emancipation of a boyhood whose leisure has been absorbed for two centuries by taking the boy's unhappy place at the grindstone and the churn. It has marched on over obstacles, despite the fact that gasoline is dangerous; that water will not put it out; that fire insurance companies frown upon its use, despite the fact that the price of gasoline is in many places high; that it is generally increasing, and that the quality of gasoline varies, and despite the fact that gasoline is unclean and foul-smelling.

Give denatured alcohol a chance, and the conquest of the internal-combustion engine will duplicate in America General Miles' exploit in Porto Rico.

In an internal-combustion alcohol engine the alcohol vapor and air are compressed in the cylinder by the piston on the return stroke, an electric spark explodes the vapor, and transmits the

power by the shaft to the engine. According to the testimony of J. C. Warnes, representing the International Harvester Company, of Chicago, most of the engines in present use can, with slight expense, be converted into alcohol engines.

Compared with gasoline, the use of denatured alcohol shows many advantages. Mr. Warnes, mentioned above, said in his testimony:

Alcohol is a suitable fuel for explosive engines; in fact it is the ideal fuel, because of its unlimited and universal source, and because of its uniform quality. Its physical properties peculiarly adapt it to economical conversion into power in the combustion chamber of an explosive engine.

Alcohol will mix with water. It has a greater capacity to absorb heat and a lower flash point than gasoline, thus preserving a more uniform temperature, and in consequence less loss by radiation, and also permitting a higher compression. Roughly speaking, alcohol possesses only half as many heat units per volume as gasoline, but, on the other hand, its thermal efficiency is twice as great, so that equal volumes will produce equal results in power. It is not so much a question of the heat units in the substance as how many of the heat units can be converted into useful work.

Prof. Elihu Thomson, of the General Electric Company, speaking of denatured alcohol as a motor fuel, said:

It may be mentioned here that our experiments developed the fact that alcohol is suitable as a motor fuel even when it contains as high a percentage as 15 per cent of water. Notwithstanding the heating value of alcohol, or the number of heat units contained is much less than that in gasoline, it is found by actual experiment that a gallon of alcohol will develop substantially the same power in an internal combustion engine as a gallon of gasoline.

This is owing to the superior efficiency of operation when alcohol is used. Less of the heat is thrown away in waste gases and in the water jacket. The mixture of alcohol vapor with air stands a much higher compression than does gasoline and air without premature explosion, and this is one of the main factors in giving a greater efficiency. It follows from this that, with alcohol at the same price as gasoline, the amount of power developed and the cost of the power will be relatively the same so far as fuel itself is concerned, but on account of the higher efficiency of the alcohol less cooling water is required, or a less percentage of the heat of combustion is communicated to the cylinder walls of the engine. The exhaust gases from the alcohol engine carry off less heat. They are cooler gases.

Leonard B. Goebbels, representing the Otto Gas Engine Works, of Philadelphia, said, before the Ways and Means Committee:

The thermal efficiency—that is, the degree of utilizing all of the heating value—of alcohol is much greater than that of gasoline, the figures being about 21 per cent for gasoline as against 30 per cent or more for alcohol. The consumption of alcohol per horsepower I found to be practically the same in volume as it was when using gasoline—that is, about one-eighth of 1 United States gallon per hour.

The Paris Journal Revue Technique recently published a series of reports from chemists showing the comparative efficiencies to be as follows:

	Per cent.
Gasoline	20
Alcohol	33
Alcohol with 10 per cent water	38

It is noteworthy that alcohol diluted 10 per cent with water is increased thereby in efficiency over 10 per cent.

In the matter of danger from fire, alcohol has every superiority over gasoline. Water spreads gasoline. It puts alcohol fire out. Professor Thomson, whom I have just quoted, said:

Gasoline is more volatile than alcohol, having a much lower boiling point, and is therefore proportionately more dangerous, especially in warm weather. The flame of burning gasoline is a highly luminous flame, one which radiates heat rapidly, whereas the alcohol flame is a faint blue or an almost nonluminous flame, which does not radiate heat to any great extent. The consequence of this is that a mass of burning gasoline will radiate sufficient heat to set fire to things at a distance from it, while heat from burning alcohol goes upward, mostly in the hot gases which rise from the flame.

Of the vast number of alcohol engines which would be made there is ample evidence. Although the alcohol engine was not perfected in Germany until 1900, and although with the small-sized farms there the demand is slight, there are 6,000 alcohol engines now in use. One central station in Berlin in 1903 had contracts for supplying 1,011 alcohol engines, of which 544 were intended for agricultural purposes. James S. Capen, representing the Detroit Board of Commerce, says there are now under contract in and about Detroit engines which will require 200,000 gallons of gasoline or alcohol per day, or 60,000,000 gallons a year—practically as much as Germany consumes of industrial alcohol altogether. And Mr. Capen added that the question of the manufacturers of the country to-day is not so much one of cost as it is a question of absolute supply of burning material. Mr. Warnes, whom I have quoted, said:

There is little doubt but the amount of denatured alcohol used for power and lighting purposes alone would far exceed the aggregate amount used for all other purposes.

He estimated that 100,000 stationary engines a year would be put out. He offered the large number of gasoline engines in use at present as an explanation of the cause of the rapidly advancing price of gasoline.

In concluding in the matter of alcohol as a power, I will submit for your consideration the following from a consular report:

#### ALCOHOL MOTORS AND PUMPS IN CUBA.

[From United States Minister Squiers, Habana, Cuba.]

Matanzas, a city of about 40,000 inhabitants, has water connection in 1,700 out of 4,000 houses, which use about 100,000 gallons a day. The waterworks, operated by an American company incorporated in the State of Delaware, are located a few miles distant from the city, where there are springs giving excellent water in sufficient quantity to supply a city of 100,000 people.

The alcohol motor pump, used on Sunday last for the first time, is of German manufacture, and cost, complete with installation, \$6,000. This motor pump is a 45-horsepower machine and is operated at a fuel cost of about 40 cents an hour, or \$4 a day of ten hours, pumping 1,000,000 gallons of water.

As alcohol here is very cheap (10 cents a gallon) the running expenses of these motors are at the minimum. The Germans are selling in Cuba many such motors for electric-lighting and water plants at very low prices. One firm has a contract to put in an alcohol motor pump at Vento, for use in connection with the Habana water supply, which is expected to develop 180 horsepower, to cost, with installation, about \$25,000, and to pump 1,000,000 gallons an hour at a fuel cost of \$1.60. The same firm has installed an electric-plant alcohol motor of 45 horsepower, which supplies 138 lights (Hersch lamps) at a fuel cost of 5 cents an hour.

I call the attention of those who are interested in our Cuban trade to the fact that at the breakfast which followed the installation there was not one article on the table of American origin except the flour in the bread.

H. G. SQUIERS, Minister.

HABANA, CUBA, August 20, 1904.

#### COOKING, HEATING, AND REFRIGERATION.

Denatured alcohol can be used for cooking. It can also operate a portable heating stove. There are about 800,000 gasoline stoves and heaters in this country. The alcohol heaters in Germany range in price from \$8.40 to \$11.50. One of the convenient novelties largely used in Germany is an alcohol flatiron with a small reservoir, which, being filled with alcohol and lighted, heats the iron for the hour's work at less than 2 cents.

One of the things the farmers need is means of refrigeration. Denatured alcohol may bring that. Professor Wiley, speaking of ethyl—that is, grain alcohol—said: "When you introduce into ethyl a molecule of chlorine you make ethyl chloride, which is not a beverage and which is impossible to drink, but which is a great refrigerant and could be used by the farmer for domestic refrigeration at much less expense than anhydrous ammonia, which is the common refrigerating agent." There is a machine in existence for the utilization of this ethyl chloride, waiting for the emancipation of denatured alcohol.

#### THE THREE OBJECTIONS.

It has been said that the progress with denatured alcohol in England has not been such as to encourage us. But England made the mistake of placing the amount of denaturant to be used too high and of burdening the industry with an excessive supervision. It is now in process of correcting its mistake. Besides England is not agricultural as we understand agriculture. Conditions in neither England nor Germany constitute in any manner an index of what can be done in America. There are in Germany 1,000,000 farms of less than 3 acres each. Our farms are estates. Our corn production is two and a quarter billion bushels annually, and 75 per cent of corn is alcohol. Most of our soil is new, and with the proper variety of potatoes, our production in tubers would far surpass that of any country in Europe.

We are a people who adapt ourselves to innovations readily. The tax on denatured alcohol in the industries has held American ingenuity, so marvelous in all other lines, in check in this. Cut the bond, and no man can estimate the uses, in number and kind, to which America would put denatured alcohol. For instance, in the western part of my State are the high plains, of unsurpassed fertility of soil and with an abundance of water beneath. Cheap fuel will raise this water for the irrigation of the uplands. It was need of cheap fuel in this regard which first attracted my attention to denatured alcohol.

Against tax-free denatured alcohol three specific arguments have been made. I will treat of them briefly, because you have heard them answered at length in the able and exhaustive speech by Mr. MARSHALL, of North Dakota.

The first of the objections is embodied in the fear that it would be possible to recover by fraud the drinkable alcohol from the denatured alcohol. While this might be done, it has been amply demonstrated by Professor Wiley and others that it will not be done. To separate the alcohol and the denaturant many redistillations, requiring the use of costly apparatus, would be necessary. Expert witnesses agree that it would be cheaper to make the alcohol from grain and pay the high tax on it than to redistill it out of the denatured alcohol. This has been so completely proved that the temperance advocates are generally favoring the measure, and several appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in its behalf. The reported bill provides a severe penalty for attempts at recovery.

The second objection is the possible impairment of the nation's revenues. About 8,000,000 gallons of taxable grain alcohol were



used in the industries in 1890, this being an estimate, no record being kept. At that time about 1,000,000 gallons of wood alcohol, untaxed, were produced. Now, about 8,000,000 gallons of wood alcohol, untaxed, are produced for domestic use, and because this wood alcohol is cheaper than the taxed grain alcohol, the wood alcohol has largely crowded the grain alcohol out of manufactures. As the Commissioner of Internal Revenue keeps no separate record of the grain alcohol used in the industries, no exact figures are available, but a careful estimate by Mr. Klein, of the Philadelphia Trades League, indicates that we would lose less than \$500,000 in revenue annually by taking the tax off denatured alcohol. Secretary Shaw, of the Treasury, says that for so great an enterprise we can stand the cut.

The third objection deals with the harmful effect of this legislation on the wood-alcohol business. Wood alcohol pays no tax. It is protected by a customs tariff. Its selling price is arbitrarily fixed through a combination. The contracts made for the purchase of the crude product are expressly voidable in event of such legislation as this, which has been expected for years. Will denatured alcohol drive wood alcohol out of the manufactures? To a large extent, yes; because denatured alcohol is better, less harmful to the workmen, and without the tax will be cheaper. Will the wood-alcohol industry be ruined? I think not. It is made as a by-product of other profitable articles. It is generally used as a denaturant and therefore if denatured alcohol comes into general use for fuel, light, and power the consumption of wood alcohol will increase. The bill reported leaves the amount of denaturant to be used and the kind to the decision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. If he fixes the amount of denaturant too high per gallon, the use of denatured alcohol for fuel, light, and power will grow more slowly because of the high price of the denaturant. In that event the wood-alcohol industry will suffer.

#### THE CAMP OF DISBELIEF.

In 1860 this country produced 90,000,000 gallons of alcohol. This was before the tax went on. David A. Wells, special commissioner, reported to the Fifty-third Congress that in his opinion 33 per cent of the whole product, prior to the imposition of any taxes on alcohol, was consumed in the arts and industries. Consequently, with a population of 30,000,000 in 1860, we used industrially and for fuel and light 30,000,000 gallons—that is, 1 gallon per capita. The same proportion to-day, leaving out of consideration new uses, new inventions, and improved methods, would bring our consumption of denatured alcohol up to 75,000,000 gallons annually.

Who doubts that it will be more? For myself, I am chiefly interested in it because it will, I believe, bring to the farmers of the prairie West a better, cleaner light than kerosene, safer, cleaner fuel than gasoline, and in many sections at a lower price. And it may bring other comforts and conveniences.

The highest economic condition in the world is found in the occupying owner of a fair-sized farm. The life that is envied in stone and steel is one of uncompromising rivalry. In a city one man's success is often built on his neighbor's bankruptcy. On the farm success comes without harm to anybody, and usually with advantage to all. We have added, through invention and legislation, many creature comforts to the farm. Invention has given implements and the telephone; science, seed selection and soil cultivation; legislation, a daily mail and daily markets.

We do not know, we can not know, how far the use of denatured alcohol on the farm would reach. But in the matter there are two camps to choose between.

One is the camp of belief, of acceptance and encouragement and adoption of innovation; of hope for less labor in the world and greater comfort; of less toil and more leisure; of ambitious reach into the dark for the bounties of the future.

The other is the camp of incredulity, where the disbeliever dwells with the ghosts of the men who opposed Stephenson's locomotive because the sparks from the smokestack would frighten the cattle at night; with the ghosts of the men who ridiculed the telephone as a toy; with the ghosts of the men who, within five years, opposed rural mail delivery as an "experiment;" with the ghost of that august member of the Cabinet who walked down Pennsylvania avenue with Professor Morse the morning Morse was to test the first telegraph wire in the world, between here and Baltimore—the Cabinet minister who was as great in his day as any man here is great in his day—the member of the Cabinet who stopped Professor Morse in the midst of his explanation and asked, with an air of polite concern, "How large a bundle, Mr. Morse, will this telegraph of yours carry from Baltimore to Washington?" [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. McGAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I hoped that I might be spared the necessity of inflicting myself upon the House at this

session, but as this bill involves a question in which the people of Chicago are particularly interested, I consider it my duty to say a word.

In my desire to do something to relieve the situation in Chicago I introduced a bill in this House for the erection of a post-office building on the West Side of the city. It was not my intention to make it a sectional question there, but simply to carry out a plan which I believe to be a good one, namely, the erection of a building near the union depot, through which passes about 50 per cent of Chicago's mail. The scheme would have the further virtues of being near the great retail district of the South Side, be more convenient to the great mail-order houses on the West Side, and at the same time be away from the congested portion of the city, where the ingress and egress are interfered with by the great number of vehicles and street cars which constantly pass along the busy streets surrounding the present post-office, and which is one of the numerous handicaps of that building.

But, Mr. Chairman, when we make a proposition of this kind we are told that Chicago just had a new post-office building. That statement is partially true. We have a Government building which, I understand, houses about sixty departments of the Government—the post-office occupying the lower floors, the mailing division being in the basement and reached by means of a driveway declining from one street through the center of the building, then up to the street on the opposite side. But it did not occur to the contractors, it seems, that it would also be necessary to get out, and now in rainy or slippery weather it is impossible for teams to draw the wagons out of that driveway, and consequently they are blocked and the mails delayed. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it was not until the building was completed in other respects that it occurred to the parties in charge that no mail chutes had been put in. They seemed to have entirely forgotten that they were building a post-office. This building is a dream of architectural beauty, but not a respectable apology for a post-office.

The exigencies of the times demand that public buildings be built for utility rather than for beauty, for business rather than for political purposes. It seems to be the consensus of the opinion of experts that in large cities post-offices should be built exclusively for post-office purposes. In the old temporary post-office at Chicago, a building two stories high and situated away from the congested part of the city, our department was well housed, the mails handled conveniently, and the work was much lighter on the employees. But to-day all this is changed. The mails are frequently delayed from twelve to twenty-four hours, and the rooms are dark and congested, and the work almost unbearable. The men in the mailing division of the Chicago post-office, I understand, average about eleven hours per day, and theirs is the hardest kind of work. These are conditions that should not and would not be tolerated by the employees of a private corporation, and which would not exist in Chicago to-day if her post-office department got what it is properly entitled to. And this brings me up to an incident to which I desire to give a passing notice. After the urgent deficiency bill had passed this House and before it had reached the Senate, Postmaster Busse, of Chicago, came down to Washington post haste and asked Congress to make an increase in the allowance for Chicago. An amendment was inserted appropriating an additional \$60,000, and that amendment was concurred in by the House. Chicago wanted 225 clerks. She got 75, and the money for the hiring of the balance seems to have been diverted to other channels. Congress is not to blame for the way the money was used, except because of the rule which prohibits the express statement as to what purposes the money is for. I want to know if that is our idea of right. I want to know if Congress has no control over the money after it is appropriated, and if its expenditure is left entirely in the discretion of the Department; and if that is true, what assurances we have that the money we now appropriate will be used for the purposes for which it was intended? The \$60,000 referred to having been appropriated at the instance of the Chicago postmaster, there could have been no question of what the intention of Congress was, no more than there could be if it had been expressly stated in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, where a private individual or corporation has a large dividend-paying establishment and numerous smaller nonself-supporting ones, instead of spending large sums of money on the smaller ones, it extends the larger one and increases its force, and consequently its output. This should be, though it seems it is not, the policy of the Government. With one year's net revenue from the Chicago post-office the Government could provide for Chicago in post-office facilities for the present generation at least.

Doing a larger business than all the Presidential offices in

the State of Pennsylvania; a larger business than all the Presidential offices in the States of Ohio and Indiana combined; more than the entire business of the cities of Philadelphia, Boston, Brooklyn, and St. Louis, in view of the immense amount of money that has been expended in these places, it seems to me that our requests are not unreasonable.

But Chicago is not suffering from a lack of facilities alone. It has been for some time suffering from a lack of help. I have called your attention to the manner in which Chicago was treated in the matter of the appropriation in the urgent deficiency bill, and I would here like to call to the attention of the House two letters, dated February 5, addressed to Mr. Fred A. Busse, postmaster, Chicago, Ill., and signed by F. H. Galbraith, superintendent of mails of the Chicago post-office, which read as follows:

MR. FRED A. BUSSE,  
Postmaster, Chicago, Ill.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 5, 1906.

SIR: In compliance with departmental instructions, fifty-five temporary clerks were dropped from the rolls of this office on Thursday, February 1, 1906. Three working days and one Sunday have passed since this curtailment of the force was made effective, and while you have received a daily report on the subject, yet I attach hereto a copy of each one of these reports in order that they may serve again to remind all concerned of the miserable kind of service we have been giving the patrons of this office during the past few days. It goes without saying that every letter, daily paper, market report, and, in fact, all matter mailed at this office should be forwarded by the first available train. However, it is now apparent to the local post-office officials that the business can not be properly handled unless we are provided with ample facilities, which, of course, includes an increase in the clerical force.

The conditions are such in the building which we are now occupying that it requires at least 150 more men to handle the business than it requires in the old quarters on the lake front. This addition to the force is absolutely necessary in order to enable us to handle in the same length of time the same quantity of mail that was handled in the old building. Nevertheless the working force has not been increased to meet the changed conditions, and, furthermore, there has in the meantime been an enormous increase in the volume of business handled. The quantity of mail handled at this office has increased fully 15 per cent during the past year, and although we have moved into a building that requires extra labor in handling the mails, yet we have no emergency fund on hand with which to employ temporary clerks, while one year ago from forty to sixty-five temporary men were employed daily.

At the present time the men are very much discouraged because of the long hours of duty. This condition is serious, but even more serious is the improper manner in which the public business is being handled in this office. It is a question as to how long the clerical force and the patrons of this office will tolerate such conditions. The clerks are tendering their resignations at an unheard-of rate, 118 having been received during the past three months. The business men of this city have made many complaints relative to delays in dispatch of their mail, but with a few more days' experience such as we have had since the first of this month the complaints will, without doubt, exceed anything we have known before.

As stated many times within the past few weeks, both verbally and in writing, it will not be possible to give the people of this city the service to which they are entitled unless the clerical force in this office is increased by the permanent appointment of at least 200 additional clerks.

Respectfully,

F. H. GALBRAITH,  
Superintendent of Mails.

CHICAGO, ILL., February 5, 1906.

HON. FRED A. BUSSE,  
Postmaster, Chicago, Ill.

SIR: You are well aware of the fact that the conditions in the new post-office building are adverse, and that we are confronted on every side with the necessity for more men than were necessary to perform the work at the temporary building on the lake front. The machinery is frequently out of order; breakdowns and clogged chutes make it necessary to take men from their regular assignments and put them to work trucking mails. For example, when conveyor No. 11 breaks down, or when it has insufficient capacity, large quantities of mail must be trucked from the north end of platform to the elevator at south end, where they are raised two floors and then trucked to the north side of the building through narrow aisles which at times are badly crowded with trucks moving in the opposite directions, a total distance covered by truckers of nearly a quarter of a mile.

The force of laborers were employed in one section in the old building, and they were therefore able to work together to good advantage. In the new building this force is divided on conveyors Nos. 4, 5, 6, 9, and 11, and divided again for the reason that attention must be given these conveyors in the basement as well as on the second floor. The same thing in a lesser degree applies to the numerous chutes, and they are at times out of working order. The cases are spread out shoe-string fashion around the outer edge of a wall 1,340 feet in length, and the trucking required on second floor is now a good big job, requiring the services of many more laborers than in the old building. The bag room is located in such an out-of-the-way place that it requires a great deal of trucking to handle the immense quantity of surplus and defective equipment turned in here from a dozen neighboring States.

We have been compelled to get along without proper light in many places, and also to do considerable janitor and carpenter work where it was an absolute necessity. The platform and driveway facilities are abominable, and in order to handle the business it has not only been necessary to divide the platform force by sending men over to Station U, and others under and over the Dearborn street sidewalk and also at entrance and exit to the driveway, but it has also been necessary to assign a large number of additional men to the platform proper. In fact, many of the various mechanical devices, while absolutely necessary, are not labor savers in any sense of the word; instead, they require many men to care for them and to operate them as planned.

The long distances, the lack of means of communication, the frequently recurring makeshifts made necessary by stoppages of machinery all contribute to our embarrassment. To summarize the situation, will say that with the same amount of work to be performed in the same

period of time conditions are such in the mailing division as to make necessary the employment of at least 150 more men than were required in the old building.

The mails have increased about 15 per cent during the past year, and this in itself, without considering the handicap in the new building, should give the mailing division about 7 per cent increase in the force, or about 65 men. This added to the number of additional clerks needed because of changed conditions make a total of 215 men, and I am certain that even that addition to the clerical force will not decrease the time of working schedules to an eight-hour basis after the 1st of March, when the advertising rush will begin.

All told, not less than 200 clerks should be provided at once; otherwise it will not be possible to give the patrons of this office the prompt and efficient service to which they are entitled.

Respectfully,

F. H. GALBRAITH,  
Superintendent of Mails.

Commenting upon the situation in Chicago, Mr. Chairman, the Chicago Record, in an editorial in its issue of February 7, says:

#### CONGRESS'S CONCERN WITH LETTERS FROM CHICAGO.

It is an unfortunate truth that Congress can never keep up with the Chicago pace. Congress is usually able to comprehend how much mail goes through the Chicago post-office about three years too late. It usually gives the postmaster the number of clerks he ought to have had several years before. It would be wiser if it gave him the number of clerks he will need a year or two in advance.

The results are serious. Clerks are brutally overworked. Mail matter is seriously delayed. The postmaster is compelled to spend time traveling back and forth between Chicago and Washington in a vain endeavor to get the wherewithal to do his work, when he ought to be free to stay here and direct the work on the spot.

Just at present the Chicago post-office is again suffering from an acute attack of shorthandedness. Last Friday the overtime of the staff of 709 clerks and laborers engaged in handling the mails was equivalent to the labor of 234 men for eight hours each. On that day 205,900 letters missed mail trains they should have reached for the sole reason that the post-office did not have human hands enough to handle them. Such facts are the strongest of arguments for a provision of more cash and more men.

Much is said these days about the relation of business to politics. In this post-office matter not enough is said. Business should be given the mail facilities it needs. Politics should be on the keen watch to make those facilities ample.

The need in this case is not a mere Chicago need. Every letter has its point of destination as well as its point of origin. Delay in the Chicago post-office does a total injury of which Chicago by itself suffers only one-half. Every Member of Congress has constituents every day who suffer from the Chicago blockade.

There must be some way by which Congress can provide the additional employees who are immediately needed. That way should be found and acted upon before the evil grows worse.

Similar commentaries have been made by the other newspapers of Chicago.

The question has been asked numerous times as to who is responsible for the conditions which prevail in Chicago, and it is usually sought to shoulder a great deal of the responsibility upon the architect and the contractors. They may be in a measure responsible, but there are also other causes. The present post-office in Chicago having been begun in 1897, following the panic of the immediate preceding years, it was impossible for the Treasury Department or the contractors to anticipate the great prosperity that was to come so soon to this country. It was just as impossible for them to foresee the enormous increase in the post-office business of Chicago as it was for you and I, Mr. Chairman, to even harbor a thought that out of the black night of business chaos and disaster should rise the sun of prosperity, more radiant in her beauty, more magnificent in her splendor, and more constant in her devotion than she had ever been since her amorous lips first kissed the cheek of this blushing young Republic. [Applause on the Republican side.] And right here, Mr. Chairman, I might say a word in reply to the argument made by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], in his debate this morning, commenting upon the question of the tariff on watches. It was brought out by a question from the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] that the Democratic party were not as sincere in their desire for tariff revision when in office as they were when out of office, and this was shown by producing the schedule which existed under the Wilson bill, which proved that it was 25 per cent ad valorem—practically the same as now. No gentleman on the other side would rise in defense of that Wilson tariff schedule, and it remains for me, Mr. Chairman, as a Republican, though not as a strict stand-patter, to defend it by saying that it did no one in this country any harm. People were not buying watches in those days. Everybody had plenty of time. [Laughter and applause.] Even the keenest appetite, fortified by the most perfect digestive organs, would fail to appreciate a metal salad in the form of a Waltham watch as a fitting substitute for beefsteak and bread. [Laughter and applause.] It is a custom, Mr. Chairman, of the gentlemen upon this side of the House to charge to the Republican party all the joys that this country has experienced since the passage of the Dingley tariff act. If that is true, then I want to hold them responsible for one thing, which may or may not be to their credit, for I believe that the Dingley tariff bill is in a measure responsible for the present intolerable conditions in the Chicago post-office, for had it not been for this measure the business would probably never have



increased as it did, from \$5,000,000 to \$12,000,000 during the construction of the present building. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, in behalf of the post-office department at Chicago, the newspapers, the business men, and, above all, the men upon whose shoulders falls the heavy work, I ask that Chicago be given that consideration which she so justly deserves. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. CURTIS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5521. An act to authorize the Tyronza Central Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Little River, in the State of Arkansas; and

S. 5438. An act to establish a light and fog signal in New York Bay at the entrance to the dredged channel at Greenville, N. J.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 87) providing for the withdrawal from public entry of lands needed for town-site purposes in connection with irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12286. An act granting relief to the estate of James Staley, deceased.

#### POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee to consume some of his time now.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yield one hour to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, there are several matters connected with postal affairs that I would be glad to discuss, but I feel impelled to devote the time allotted to me in discussing the item in the bill designated, I believe, by officials as the "special-facility" appropriation, but commonly known as the "subsidy." I could have contented myself with voting against this item without giving the reasons of my opposition if prominent citizens and influential business organizations had not been more than usually active in urging my support of it. In former years, when I received resolutions from city officials, boards of trade, manufacturers' clubs, or chambers of commerce favoring it, and by letter replied to them that I had investigated the matter and considered it unwise, unnecessary, and contrary to just principles, I was permitted to vote in accordance with my judgment, with no unkind criticism from my constituents, so far as reached my ears, except from the adherents of my political opponent in the campaign of 1902. I knew, of course, that my position was not satisfactory to the companies into whose coffers this money went and that my votes had incurred their disapproval.

But, Mr. Chairman, this year I have received so many resolutions and letters, many of them from my own district and some of them expressing a desire to know the grounds of my opposition, that a respect for their opinions, a desire for their good will, and a hope for their approval require me to consume this time upon this subject.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that had I hesitated to discuss this matter it would have been attributed to, if not justified by, a very natural disposition—an unwillingness to become a target for the assaults of the demagogue. When I recall that the main line of the Southern Railway, the chief beneficiary of this appropriation, runs through the district that honors me, and that this company operates in every one of its counties, having more than 350 miles of line in operation in the district, and think of the demagogic charge which will be repeated against me this year if my party shall again nominate me, that I have "voted against helping a southern enterprise," that I have "opposed the interests of my constituents," I would shudder for my political fate if I did not have confidence in the integrity and intelligence of the people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, due consideration should always be given to the resolutions received from his constituents by a Representative. If he should believe that such resolutions represent the judgment of a majority of those who sent him here, and that such majority with full information wishes to instruct him how to vote, it would at once become his duty to comply with them or resign. No such condition confronts me. I am satisfied that to-day the overwhelming majority of my constituents are not in favor of this "subsidy," and that upon a full under-

standing of the facts and principles involved not 500 Democrats could be found within the entire district who would advise me to support it. I believe that a majority of the members of the very organizations which have communicated with me would approve my position. This is no reflection upon them, but a compliment to their candor.

Busily engaged as they are in developing the resources and contributing to the wonderful progress of the South; their energies devoted to occupations and pursuits which limit their time for research and consideration upon the manifold questions of legislation upon which, from one influence or another, they are called upon to express themselves; the information furnished them so frequently being given by interested parties and upon one side only of a proposition; their lack of direct responsibility for the legislative action, relying, as they so often do, upon the judgment of those whom they have chosen to represent them and who, on account of having the time to more thoroughly investigate such questions and the opportunity of hearing both sides, are in a better position to reach the right conclusion—all these tend to secure the passage of resolutions by such organizations without a thorough knowledge of the facts and a full consideration of the principles at stake and without that care and deliberation which they would exercise before requesting their city council to institute an important enterprise. As an illustration, the head of one of the most prominent business organizations in my State, a gentleman of ability and accuracy, who forwarded to me the resolutions of his organization in favor of this item, in reply to a letter from me asking the reasons for thinking his city would be deprived of adequate mail facilities in case of the defeat of this item, stated that he delayed answering until he "could make some investigation and answer more intelligently," plainly indicating, it seemed to me, that sufficient investigation had not been given the matter prior to the passage of the resolutions. Frequently, however, such resolutions are of the soundest principles and of the highest merit. I give all resolutions consideration and am always glad to receive them, and especially from my constituents, but when one reaches me upon which I have reason to think my information is wider and more accurate and whose underlying principle I can not indorse, I shall adhere to my own judgment in the matter.

The items which I am now opposing read as follows:

For necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Washington to Atlanta and New Orleans, \$142,728.75: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made by this paragraph shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

For continuing necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans., \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

Under the regular pay, exclusive of the subsidy, the trunk lines from Washington to New Orleans, for transportation and cars, receive from the Government the sum of \$1,227,437.09.

It seems no one can speak for this special appropriation without relying upon the provisions apparently placing it in the discretion of the Postmaster-General. As to this let us see how the Department regards it. It puts the entire responsibility on Congress, where it really belongs. (Page 339 of last hearings.) In this House on April 26, 1900, the Assistant Postmaster-General's testimony on this point was quoted as follows:

Although on its face it appears to be a discretionary power, yet when Congress, after full debate year after year, has put this provision in the bill and made the appropriation, the Post-Office authorities can not construe it otherwise than as indicating the wish of Congress that it shall be spent, and have understood it as mandatory.

On the same day the Postmaster-General's testimony touching it was quoted as follows:

Well, the Department would have power to withhold it, but having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, the Department is bound to assume that Congress desires the appropriation to be expended so long as it is made.

In the hearing this year, on page 323, the Assistant Postmaster-General says:

We still adhere to the policy of not recommending or estimating for any special facility service anywhere in the country.

And he adds, however, that if Congress appropriates they will continue to use it to the best advantage. So without doubt the Department, regardless of the provisions attached to the appropriation, considers it mandatory on it to expend it. When the money is appropriated how can you expect a Department official to withhold it from the railroads? Congress expects them to get it. Do you think Congress would appropriate this subsidy if it did not want the railroads to have it? Certainly not. No man votes for it unless he wants the railroads to get it, and this is the view the Department must take of it. If a gentleman here votes for it who does not want the railroad companies to get it, I would be glad to hear him say so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see how the Department stands on the policy of granting this appropriation. I quote the following from Postmaster-General Wanamaker before this appropriation was made to the lines from here to New Orleans and insist that his statements are just as sound now as then and apply with equal force to this appropriation:

I believe the granting to a few and refusing to extend like compensation to the many who are performing as good or better mail schedules is a source of injury to the mail service. The preferential method should cease or all who expedite the mails should be granted the same benefit. (His report for year ending June 30, 1902.)

In his letter of date February 25, 1892, to the committee, he said:

I do not believe there exists occasion for perpetuating the preferential method whereby a limited number would be paid both ordinary and special transportation and full car compensation, while other railroads performing precisely the same character of service can be allowed nothing more than the compensation which we are by statute permitted to pay for ordinary transportation.

Again, he says:

When the special facility payments were first started it was well understood that they were but temporary, so as to bridge over a period until the natural growth of the mails would yield sufficient compensation to do away with occasion for additional compensation.

He further said—and this was long before the Southern was subsidized:

The distance from Washington to New Orleans via Atlanta is 1,143 miles. The time for the most important mail train averages 35 miles per hour.

Mr. Chairman, one of the subsidized trains to which I will again refer now, fourteen years later, with all the incidental improvements during that time, averages less than 35 miles an hour. From the days of Mr. Wanamaker till now not one Postmaster-General has ever recommended this appropriation. The present officials do not favor it. General Shallenberger does not recommend it or estimate for it. He says in the hearings:

We would estimate if we desired it.

We are not asking it, nor expressing opinions in reference to it.

I have not said I think it ought to be retained.

He further said:

I think for the good of the service at large it is better that no special favors be given to any particular road or system.

But, Mr. Chairman, one of the most direct recommendations against this appropriation is found on page 9 of Postmaster-General Cortelyou's last report. He says:

Curtailment has been recommended wherever possible, and many decreases are shown, of which the following are examples: Railway transportation, special facilities, \$167,728.75.

Thus he names these two items together as the first example of those which he recommends to be omitted from this bill.

They are alike in principle, and as the fate of the smaller appropriation doubtless will follow the larger, I shall confine my discussion to the larger one. Since no Postmaster-General has ever recommended this appropriation, since for more than a dozen years it has been omitted from the estimates of the Department submitted to this body, the burden of sustaining it properly belongs to those who advocate it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BLACKBURN. What was the result of the investigation of the committee as to the difference in time?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I am going to discuss the time. I think I have given this matter full investigation, and if the gentleman will listen I think I can show him he ought to vote against these items. Let us consider the reasons given in its support, both in this House and elsewhere; and as I proceed if I should state any fact that anyone has reason to think incorrect, I would be glad to have my attention called to it. So far as I can recall, no reason is now given that has not been given for a dozen years. Every argument made in behalf of its continuation now, when Nos. 37 and 97 get the appropriation, were given years ago, when No. 35 got part of it, and I challenge its advocates to give a new reason.

The same sweeping assertions of its great accomplishments, and direful predictions of inadequate facilities in case this appropriation was discontinued, were made long before No. 97 was created. We were told that without this appropriation No. 35 could not run. To-day No. 35 does not get a dollar of it, but it runs, and runs under the advertised name of the "United States Fast Mail." The record is full of fears and declarations that without special recognition on the part of the Government the so-called extraordinary service which was given before No. 97 was heard of, and of which No. 35 was the main train, could not possibly be maintained. We heard the same arguments three or four years ago about the subsidy from New York to this city, and in fact then the stress was put on the New York train and the necessity for a subsidy for it. The subsidy was

discontinued from New York to this place, and now we have a better schedule than then. Mr. Chairman, once we had subsidies from New York to Springfield, from New York to Albany, from Baltimore to Hagerstown, New York to Philadelphia, Philadelphia to Washington, and these subsidies were discontinued, and I am informed not a single train was discontinued in either case, but that the service was just as good after discontinuance of the subsidy as before. I further understand that in one case the railroad company stated that discontinuance of the subsidy would not affect the situation.

Another thing in this connection is that the speed of a train does not depend upon subsidies. There are many trains in the United States carrying mail that make better time than the subsidized trains. The Southern runs six passenger trains daily from Washington to Charlotte, N. C., and also No. 97, which is a mail and express train. One of the passenger trains, leaving Washington at 10.45 at night, No. 37, is a subsidized train. It runs to Charlotte in ten hours and forty minutes. No. 31, which runs daily, except Sunday, goes to Charlotte in nine hours and thirty-eight minutes, or one hour and two minutes quicker than the subsidized No. 37. It ought to be needless to refer to the argument that the appropriation goes to a southern enterprise, and therefore should have support, though such has been a serious contention in this House in the past. One of my constituents wrote me that it "was coming our way." As far as the money is concerned, it goes to the railroad stockholders, the vast majority of whom do not live in the South. Referring to this very appropriation a present member of the Cabinet in 1899, then a Member of this House from Massachusetts, said that the only people who were benefited by this appropriation were the stockholders of the railway, and he called it a gift to the railroads. While the trains go South, nearly the whole appropriation goes elsewhere. It has always been beyond my power to comprehend how the justice or the right of a thing depended upon its locality. For myself, I fail to see how any appropriation, otherwise wrong, can be made right because of its "coming our way." [Applause.] If it is right, to support it by such an argument tends to discredit it, as it is an appeal to selfishness and not to judgment.

It has been argued that this appropriation aids in building up the industries of the South. This presupposes that this appropriation gives the South her postal facilities, which we deny, and this is one of the disputed facts. Proper mail facilities no doubt aid the country, but whether the subsidy creates such facilities or whether the business of the country creates them is one of the issues. I contend that the business of the country creates and of necessity requires just such facilities as the railroads furnish, and that no facilities are furnished to the South except such as are essential to the railroad's continued enrichment from her business and industry. I deny that the Southern put on either of the trains running from this city until there was a direct and immediate necessity therefor in order to handle its traffic with proper dispatch. The amount of that traffic has fixed and its demands have created the service which the company is furnishing. The company was created to serve the public. It grows rich by it. The public has made it, not it the public.

Mr. LAMB. Has it not contributed a good deal toward that prosperity?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The railroad has been an essential element in it, but this in no way affects my argument. There are many able advocates of this subsidy around me who will again vote for it, as they have voted for it heretofore. When you come to reply, since the Department did not recommend these items, the burden is yours to show their necessity and propriety. You can not deny the facts I shall state, for I have taken them from the best available statistics, and I challenge you to refute them. I repeat, the business of the country has made the railroad. As the industry of the people has developed it has extended, as it had to extend, its freight and its passenger service. But some one says, Look what service the system gave the people fourteen years ago before it got this subsidy and mark now the great improvement. He seems to forget that in that time there has been great improvement on every great railroad system in the country. You can name no great railroad that has remained stationary upon its service of fourteen years ago. The improvement in mail trains does not exceed, if indeed it equals, the improvement in through freight service.

Can any process of reasoning conclude that, except for the subsidy, the Southern Railway of all the great systems would alone have made no progress in its public service since 1892? Did it of all the systems alone require special help and discriminative favoritism to encourage it to keep up with the progress of the times and properly serve the great section that has



poured millions into its treasury? I refuse to entertain the thought, and I remind this House that, in his report for the year ending June 30, 1892, before the Southern got this subsidy, the Postmaster-General complimented the Richmond and Danville (now the Southern), along with three other roads operating in the South, with expediting the mail to a great extent.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman know how long it was after this appropriation was voted by Congress before No. 97 was ever put on?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The gentleman anticipates me. But another one says this subsidy gives us train No. 97. This we deny. If it be true, why didn't it give us 97 twelve years ago? The Southern has been getting this subsidy since July 1, 1893. Why did it withhold from the people No. 97 for ten years if the subsidy gives the people that train? The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 1898, sets out a letter from Hon. James E. White, general railway mail superintendent, of date February 4, 1898, in which he said:

The Southern Railway, which is paid from this appropriation for special facilities, has not put on an extra train nor has it changed its schedule by reason of this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, the great truth is that No. 97 was never thought of until the greatly increased passenger traffic—and under that head I class passengers, mail, and express—so loaded down its other trains that these were unable to make their schedules, and the running of another train became a traffic necessity. Why, does any intelligent person believe that train No. 37, leaving Washington at 10.45 at night, would be discontinued except for the subsidy? Can he give a reason for such belief? Yet the entire subsidy over the Southern is divided between that train and No. 97, which leaves here at 8 a. m.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Under this appropriation, is not 97 the only one that gets this extra pay?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. No, sir; the gentleman labors under a mistake. This subsidy is divided between 37 and 97.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I was asking the gentleman for information, and I want to ask him this further question. Does the Southern road run through your district and mine?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. It does.

Mr. BLACKBURN. How much advantage do your people get from 97?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. They get some advantage from 97, but none, in my judgment, from the special-facility provision, as I hope to show as I proceed.

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is why I asked you.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Those who fear that trains Nos. 37 and 97 would be discontinued have not the faith in the Southern that I have. Should Congress discontinue the subsidy, I do not know what schedules or trains, if any, would be affected. I feel sure that none should be affected unless the increased traffic again justifies a change for the improvement of the service. I refuse to believe that that great system would act in a spirit of pique and withhold from the people whose industry and business sustain it proper and adequate facilities in accordance with their needs. The Southern collected from the people last fiscal year over \$48,000,000 of earnings, of which over \$14,400,000 were net. Of these vast sums, over \$24,000,000 were earned in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, of which over \$8,400,000 were net earnings. The entire subsidy to the Southern is \$80,947.50, the balance of it going to roads from Atlanta to New Orleans. In other words, out of every \$600 which the Southern collects \$1 is subsidy. Now, will anyone assert his belief that on account of losing \$1 out of \$600, which would still leave over \$14,300,000 net earnings, the Southern would deprive its patrons of adequate mail facilities? Mr. Chairman, I again declare that I have more faith in the Southern than to expect that. I have more faith than the boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and manufacturers' clubs in the thriving cities along its line in its sense of justice and propriety. The total earnings of all the railroads in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina for the year ending June 30, 1905, were two and one-fourth times the earnings in same States for year ending June 30, 1894. Wonderful increase in eleven years.

In the last fifteen years the capital invested in cotton mills in the South has increased from \$60,000,000 to \$225,000,000. The value of the cotton crop has nearly doubled. The value of manufactured products increased from less than \$1,000,000,000 to \$1,750,000,000—an increase of \$750,000,000. The value of farm products has more than doubled, and a hundred other evidences of progress abound. These have built up the railroads; these have required the improved service; and, Mr. Chairman, I can not appreciate properly the innocent zeal and the agile comprehension of one who ignores such facts and declares that the subsidy is responsible for the improved mail facilities of the South.

Mr. LAMB. I would like to have you define a subsidy.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I am going to do it. I have anticipated all of these arguments because I have read every speech that has been made in favor of this thing from the beginning, and I am ready to answer their arguments.

Mr. STANLEY. Has the gentleman ever heard of a high official of the railroad who did not promise in the way of a threat to take away from the people an advantage they have when you threaten to take away a subsidy?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The Pennsylvania Railroad, I understand, about four years ago stated that the discontinuance of the subsidy from New York to this city would not affect its schedules.

Mr. Chairman, the business of the Southern Railroad system in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina has grown so rapidly that its passenger earnings per mile of road operated in the last eleven years have increased from \$1,675 to over \$2,400 and its freight earnings from \$2,325 to over \$4,400 per mile; its total earnings from \$4,000 per mile to over \$6,800; showing an increase of \$2,800 per mile, with a greatly increased mileage. Doubtless on its main line from here to Charlotte all earnings were greatly in excess of the above averages, and there is no doubt in my mind that the increase of earnings has been far greater from here to Charlotte than on any other part of the road.

Eleven years ago this system wanted and got \$125 subsidy per mile to give the people adequate facilities. The road is now earning \$2,800 more per mile than then, and yet it still wants \$125 per mile subsidy to give its patrons adequate postal facilities, although every facility it now offers is justified and required by its increased business. Then its operating expenses in the three States named were 71 per cent of its gross earnings, now only 65 per cent, and yet the defenders of the appropriation assert that the South can not get proper mail facilities without the subsidy. Then its net earnings in these three States were \$2,733,974, and last year they were \$8,441,821, and still we are told it is not able to stand alone and give the people adequate facilities under the statutory pay.

In 1893, when this subsidy was first paid to this system, it ran only three passenger trains from here to Charlotte, Nos. 37, 11, and 35. Now it runs six through trains besides No. 97, so great has its passenger traffic increased. Can intelligence and candor assert that all these increased passenger trains have been put on by reason of the subsidy? There is just as much reason for such assertion as there is for the assertion that No. 97 is a product of the subsidy.

A familiar statement made by advocates of this subsidy, both in and out of this Hall, is that Congressmen vote for other appropriations which such advocates think are similar in principle, and one of the most common instances cited is the rural free-delivery service, which is not in fact, circumstance, or principle in any way related to it. It would be possible to likewise subsidize the rural service in this way; that is, give the carriers whose starting points are post-offices on the trunk line of railway from Washington City to New Orleans, and also to those carriers on the railway from Kansas City to Newton, Kans., but to no other carriers in the country, the sum of \$300 each per annum in addition to the \$720 they are now receiving, provided however, that no carrier should receive any of such additional pay for any day when he was more than a half hour behind his schedule in delivering his mail. Then it would be in principle like this railroad subsidy.

Doubtless many of the carriers who received such additional compensation for being prompt would desire its continuance, and its friends would have a multitude of arguments showing its necessity, and expressing fear that without it such carriers could no longer maintain such horses as would enable them to properly serve their patrons, owing to the peculiar condition of the country between Washington and New Orleans, and that if such additional compensation were withdrawn so that all carriers in the United States would be on the same footing and all receive pay under the same law, then it would be a strike at the South and her industry. [Applause.] But suppose some one thinks that some Member has voted for one wrong; will he contend that such Member is thereby required to support another? It is better to be inconsistent and right part of the time than to be consistent and wrong all the time. It is frequently urged in behalf of this item that one of the subsidized trains carries no passengers, but is an exclusive mail and express train. There are other roads that run such trains without subsidies. (Hearings, 207.) There are unsubsidized roads which do better than that and run exclusive mail trains without passengers or express (St. Louis to Kansas City, Chicago to Omaha, hearings, 208), and the route between St. Louis and Kansas City does not get as much pay per mile as the Southern

from here to Danville gets under the regular rate. There are 3,064 railroad mail routes in the United States. Of all that number only fifteen get more pay per mile than the route from here to Danville under the regular pay, and each of these fifteen gives more mail trips per week than from Washington to Danville, except three. There are scores of routes that have more trips with less pay than this one. The average pay for transportation of mails throughout the United States is \$198.20 per mile.

The Southern from here to Danville gets, according to the regular rate, \$1,497.10 per mile for transportation and \$325 per mile for rent of cars, a total of \$1,822.10 per mile for carrying the mail, exclusive of the subsidy, or \$434,169.28 for carrying the mail two hundred and thirty-eight and a fraction miles, and yet there are people who think it could not give proper mail facilities without being coaxed to keep its schedules by giving it an extra bonus of \$125 per mile. It is my judgment that never has there been a more unjustifiable subsidy or bonus paid from the Public Treasury to any man or corporation. From here to Charlotte this company is paid for transportation of mails and rent of cars under the regular pay the great sum of \$647,253.52, but so great is the misinformation on this subject that many of the good people of that city fear that unless we continue to take from the Treasury and give this company \$125 per mile to induce it to keep its schedules that the railroad company will in some way deprive them of proper postal facilities. From Washington to Charlotte the total pay for transportation of mails and rent of cars when the subsidy was first authorized was \$232,742.15. It is now more than two and a half times what it was then, and yet we are told the subsidy is still a necessity. More than that, the regular pay without the subsidy now is more than two and a fourth times what the company then received together with the subsidy, but the company holds on to the subsidy and will forever do so until Congress does its duty by discontinuing it. From here to Charlotte, under the regular rates, the Southern is paid more money per mile for carrying mail than any other road gets in the United States south of the Potomac and Ohio and west of the Missouri rivers, and yet gentlemen think it ought to have the subsidy.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. How much do the trunk lines from here to New Orleans get?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. From here to New Orleans, \$1,227,437.09, exclusive of the subsidy.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That is based on the weight?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. On the weight, at the regular rates paid all roads.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. That is, on the volume of business?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. On the volume of business, without any preferential involved in it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, of all I have heard or read on this subject, and I have endeavored to make a thorough research concerning it, while I have encountered many fears that train No. 97 would disappear with this appropriation stricken out, I have found but two expressions of opinion, so far as I can recall, that such would be the result—one in a letter and the other expressed in this House by a Representative during a discussion in February of last year.

So far as I am informed, no man anywhere believes or even fears that the other subsidized train, No. 37, would be taken off. It will occur to everyone that some official of the interested railway companies would expressly declare that these trains would be taken off without the subsidy, if such would be the effect of the discontinuance of the subsidy. No official has made such declaration to this body or its committee, for the simple reason, in my judgment, that no official believes it.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if any official of the Southern road appeared before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I am not on that committee, but suppose the Southern Railroad thought it was unnecessary for it to appear there, where had been developed so much friendship for it in times past on this proposition. [Applause.]

The railroad can not handle its mail, express, and passenger traffic from this city to Charlotte with two less trains than it now operates. Doubtless the day is not far distant when another train will have to be added to the present number. As I before intimated, I have no idea that either of these trains would be discontinued, unless the company should act in a spirit of resentment, and this I will not anticipate; but, on the contrary, I anticipate that it will continue to serve its patrons on business principles. One effect, I think, might follow, and regardless of the subsidy may follow, and that is other cars may be added to No. 97—maybe passenger cars. If such added cars should

reduce its speed to the present speed of No. 31, it would reach Charlotte, N. C., eighteen minutes later than it now reaches Charlotte, and would reach Atlanta about thirty-two minutes later than it now does, which to the citizens of Atlanta would mean nothing, as it can make no difference whether their mail reaches there at 11.15 at night or an hour later, as people do not open their mail at midnight. Even as it is now it reaches Charlotte at 5.15 in the afternoon; and if we allow a reasonable time for it to reach the post-office, be opened, and delivered we will find that it is after business hours.

I want to call your attention to the fact that No. 97 was not put on by requirement of the Post-Office Department, as some may think, and its speed was not regulated by the Department. The Post-Office Department does not regulate the speed of any train. The Post-Office Department does not know the engines, roadbed, or other conditions upon which the speed of trains is determined. It has never undertaken to regulate the speed of a train. In regard to this particular train, it exercises sufficient control to hold it on its starting time some little after its regular schedule, if necessary to make connections.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Until the arrival of the New York train?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Yes; if the New York train is not very late.

The portion of the subsidy which goes to it would not run a train which otherwise would be unnecessary and unremunerative. We have been told that the Coast Line voluntarily quit asking for the subsidy, though it continued to run the train which got all of it, because it would not maintain certain schedules for it. If that is true, does anyone think another road would, on account of the subsidy, put on an otherwise unnecessary train, which would get only one-half of it? And is it not reasonable and is it not the fact, as I believe it, that the Southern is running only those trains which are necessary to its traffic, and running them only at such speed as itself fixes, and starts them from this city at such times as it deems best for its business and the accommodation of its patrons, as every road is in duty bound to do? If under these circumstances, in addition to the regular revenues which come to all roads alike, it can also get from the public Treasury these extra thousands of subsidy for its stockholders, in these days of frenzied finance it will not hesitate to do it; and if Members of Congress intend to give this subsidy until the conscience of the favored railroad companies cries out against it, we had as well place it among our permanent laws and confess to the world that we have been unequal to the task confided to us by the people. [Applause.]

The responsibility is upon us, not upon others, and not upon the Department. We are the ones who ought to stand between the grasping greed of all great corporations and the people's Treasury. [Applause.] If you authorize the expenditure of this money to great corporations that will certainly bring pressure upon any official to get it into their own coffers, you need not expect any one official to resist their demands, if we ourselves can not resist them.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company runs a special mail train out of St. Louis to Pittsburg, running through my district in southern Illinois. I ask this question, because the gentleman seems to be familiar with these subsidies and the postal-car regulations. That train carries nothing but mail, not even a coach. It is a special mail train.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Yes; there are many such trains in the country.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman, purely for information, whether he knows if that line received any subsidy or remuneration from the Government outside of the regular mail pay, or whether it has ever received any?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I do know that it is not receiving any. I do know that for many years not a cent of subsidy has been paid except to the through line from here to New Orleans, and to the Santa Fe road from Kansas City, Mo., to Newton, Kans. The only other line that has received a cent of subsidy in thirteen years is the one from here to New York, and the subsidy to it was discontinued several years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can show that the train No. 97 is a highly paying, probably the best paying, train, exclusive of the subsidy, which the Southern operates between here and the city of Charlotte in proportion to its expense. It would be foreign to this debate to discuss at this time the excessive rates charged by railroads for freight and passengers. In what I am now about to say I shall not discuss the capitalization of the Southern, though



I will note in passing that the letter of ex-Senator Chandler of February 5, 1906, says its one hundred and eighty millions of stock is all water, nor will I discuss the regular mail pay under the statutes, which I believe to be excessive, nor the fact that the Government pays rent for each of the postal cars used on No. 97, and 37, too, as for that, from here to Atlanta, something like \$16,000 each year, or about three times the average car rental—this being true, since postal cars of that class get every year from the Government \$25 per mile of daily use—the rental of cars by the Government being also excessive. It has been stated in the House that the Government pays the railroads four times as much as it costs to carry the mails. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General in his report tells us that the companies plead for the through mail wherever there is competition. I would be glad to see the proper committee of this House propose a reduction in the regular mail pay and in the post-office car rentals. But taking things as they are, I propose to show that No. 97 is a train of great profit to the railway company, exclusive of the subsidy. I presume that it carries the same proportion of the mail from Danville to Charlotte as from Washington to Danville. In a letter replying to an inquiry from me, General Shallenberger, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, on February 23, 1906, said that at the last quadrennial weighings it was computed that No. 97 carried 35 per cent of the whole weight of mail between Washington and Danville, and that 35 per cent was 45,183 pounds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, No. 97 therefore gets 35 per cent of the transportation mail pay. The entire regular mail-transportation pay from here to Charlotte is, exclusive of car rents, \$525,974.52, and 35 per cent thereof, which goes to No. 97, is \$184,091.08, to which add the rental of the three post-office cars to Charlotte, \$28,521, and we have a total of regular pay for No. 97 from here to Charlotte of \$212,612.08; and, of course, it gets large pay from Charlotte to Atlanta, but not as much per mile as from here to Charlotte. There is not so much mail handled between those two places as from here to Charlotte, and there is not as much from Danville to Charlotte as from here to Danville. To this must be added what No. 97 receives from the express company, for it is a mail and express train. We know that a carload of express is much heavier than a postal carload of mail, perhaps three times as great, as the postal cars must have racks and plenty of space for the clerks to conveniently distribute the mail. But suppose the Southern's No. 97 only collects from the express company one-fourth of what it collects from the Government, which would be \$53,153.02, then it earns from here to Charlotte, exclusive of the subsidy, \$265,765.10, while its part of the subsidy from here to Charlotte is \$23,767.50. With these facts staring one in the face, can he contend that a train that otherwise earns \$265,765.10 will be discontinued if the subsidy is withdrawn? [Applause.] I do not believe that another train of the Southern earns as much as this one, according to its expense. I desire here to say that if any of my estimates or calculations are erroneous and any authorized railroad official will give me the exact facts and figures sustaining them, I will be glad to correct my remarks, even if I have to make another speech to do so. I will add however, that I have made inquiry, both of the railway company and the express company as to the quantity of express handled on train No. 97, and both replied that they did not have the information.

Another fact, for the year ending June 30, 1904, being the last year for which I have been able to get the statistics on this point, the average earnings of the Southern's passenger trains in Virginia, North and South Carolina, and these earnings include passenger, mail, and express, were less than 99 cents for each mile such trains ran, while the average earnings of train No. 97 from here to Charlotte, exclusive of the subsidy, according to figures above stated, are \$1.91 for each mile run, or nearly double the general average.

Let us consider the matter in another way. If my estimate above is correct, then, exclusive of the subsidy, train No. 97, from here to Charlotte, earns each day from mail and express the sum of \$727, while its daily part of the subsidy is \$68.12. Now comes the question of its average daily expense, and of this I speak not as an expert, but as one who would be glad to have the exact figures if they are in existence. I shall give you my own estimates, but shall be glad to correct them if wrong. I understand that from here to Charlotte, a distance of 380 miles, three engines are used on No. 97 and three engine crews, though the last engine and crew go far beyond Charlotte, and therefore I estimate for two and a half crews from here to Charlotte. The Government of course pays the mail clerks, and the express company pays its men, and the train carries no baggage. Let us estimate that the engineers are paid \$8 apiece, or \$20 a day, and the firemen \$4 apiece, or \$10,

making the daily cost of enginemen and firemen on No. 97 from here to Charlotte \$30. Suppose the conductor and his help together get \$15 a day, and that oil, water, coal, and other material cost \$82 a day, at a very liberal estimate, which will make a total cost of the train from here to Charlotte of \$127 each day, or of \$46,355 a year. But to this cost should be added the train's proper part of the expense of the maintenance of the offices, shops, roadbed, repairs, etc., of the company, which I will put at \$100 a day, or \$36,500 a year, making a total cost chargeable to this train of \$227 per day from here to Charlotte, or \$82,855 a year, leaving a daily net profit of \$500, or a clear profit of over 200 per cent, or a yearly profit of \$182,500, exclusive of the subsidy. If it carries the express on a free pass without charge, then on the mail alone this train clears \$130,000 a year, or more than 150 per cent profit.

Now, then, who will say that as a business proposition this railroad would discontinue this train if we vote away from this train \$23,000? [Applause.] No; so I maintain if it ever discontinues this train it will be in a spirit of pique and resentment, because the representatives of the people, acting upon their judgment and conscience in this matter, refuse to gratify the greed of the company by a bonus. [Applause.]

Notwithstanding all these facts, Mr. Chairman, many of my constituents have been so misled on this subject that they urge me to vote to give the company this subsidy. And more than that, some prominent newspapers of the South, some of them in my State, have endeavored to reflect upon and embarrass those of us from the South who refuse to sacrifice our judgment and conscience upon this matter. One paper named me and said that in voting against this subsidy I would vote against my section of the country. One has declared that the appropriation is opposed in ignorance and stupidity or from a malignant attempt to hurt the South. This paper probably never gave the question an hour's research or a moment's consideration. If with full knowledge it made that declaration, it only shows to what lengths of error and vituperation the defenders of injustice and favoritism will go in assailing the motives and character of those whose facts they can not deny and whose argument they can not answer.

Another paper has commented on the fact that while the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET] champions this appropriation, it is opposed by some Southern Representatives through whose districts the fast mail runs. When one understands the matter, the remarkable thing is not that some Democrats differ with the gentleman from Indiana, but that any Democrats agree with him on this appropriation. [Loud applause.] Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party is practically a unit against the ship-subsidy bill. In my judgment, there is more to condemn in principle in this appropriation than in the ship-subsidy bill. Under it the subsidy proposed would apply to all our steamship lines alike, thus having some show of equality in it, while this "special facility" pay does not apply to all roads alike, but is a special favoritism bestowed alone upon the lines from here to New Orleans and from Kansas City to Newton.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I yield ten minutes more. I regret I can not give the gentleman any more time.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. It is beyond my understanding how any Democrat can oppose the ship subsidy and then support the railroad subsidy. Frequently gentlemen object to this appropriation being called a "subsidy." It is a subsidy or worse—a bonus, a gift. According to Webster's International Dictionary, a subsidy is a grant from the government to a "company to assist in the establishment or support of an enterprise deemed advantageous to the public." Is it not, according to the argument of its own supporters, a grant to the railroad to assist it in running two trains for the advantage of the public? Ordinarily governments have not subsidized any company unless its business was otherwise unprofitable, but here you subsidize companies whose business is greatly profitable. You give from the people's money to increase the treasury of the railroad. You subsidize trains for passengers and express as well as mail. Every pound of express carried on No. 97 and every passenger and all express on No. 37 are subsidized as well as the mail. Passengers and express get the benefit. What would a passenger say if the railroad should try to collect from him extra pay for getting him to his station on time, and what would one say who should be required to pay for his express an extra price because it came in due time. Yet you pay these companies extra for getting the mail to Charlotte on time. The railroad company fixes its schedule and you subsidize it to keep its own schedule. If it makes the schedule, it gets that day's sub-

sidy; if it fails to make it, that day's subsidy is withheld. It is a bonus to induce the company to do its duty. Every day the company does its duty it gets this extra pay. If No. 97 leaves here on time and is five minutes behind the schedule which the company has fixed for it at Danville and Charlotte and Atlanta, it does not get for that day a cent of this subsidy, though it makes the trip; but if it is on time it gets the extra pay. I therefore state that it is a pure bonus to the railroad not to enable it to run the subsidized trains, but merely to persuade it in running them to keep its own schedules. [Applause.]

So strange are the influences that control actions that business men in my district, who would stand a lawsuit before they would pay the company an extra dollar over and above the regular price for getting them or their freight or express to their town on time, though by a subsidized train, yet urgently request me to vote to pay the company extra, over and above the regular statutory price, for getting the mail there on time.

We have heard much of the fines levied against these trains by the Department, and doubtless many people think the so-called fines are a punishment. If they were fined every day in the year by withholding the subsidy, they would then get the same pay as other roads. It is really, instead of being a punishment when they fail to keep the schedules, a bonus when they do keep them—such as no other roads in the country have.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have quite fully discussed this matter, but I desire it understood that my main opposition is to the principle involved in it. If we, by reason of our great industries, progressive enterprise, and increasing business, are entitled, as I contend we are, to the facilities which we now enjoy, then the great companies that are enriched by that business and enterprise should furnish us adequate mail facilities at the very profitable rates allowed to all under the general law, and it becomes a profligate waste of public money and an inexcusable badge of favoritism to grant this subsidy to the railroad companies.

If, on the other hand, our energy, business, enterprise, and traffic do not justify our present facilities and this subsidy bestowed upon the people along the main line from Washington to New Orleans facilities to which they are not entitled, while withholding similar help from millions of our fellow-citizens who have not mail facilities equal to ours, then this subsidy becomes a vicious piece of partiality, a special privilege to a section, a legislative preference which, in my judgment, no Democrat should encourage and no patriot approve. On the one hand it is legalized graft to the companies; on the other it is legalized graft to their patrons. In either case it is unwise, vicious, undemocratic, and unworthy of the tolerance of a just Government. If the people—as I hope they soon will be—were as ready to condemn votes against their interests and to approve those in favor of justice and equality as the recipients of special privileges are ready to oppose those who resist their greed and to support those who vote for their projects, this subsidy would, in my opinion, long ago have been discontinued. [Applause.] I rejoice that the people, through the benefits of the press and the daily mail, are rapidly becoming watchful of public conduct.

Among those who have urged my support doubtless there are many misinformed, some misled, and others misdirected. Wide in scope, strong in effect, and varied in operation are the influences which have molded opinion upon this subject along the subsidized railway lines. Information has been withheld where knowledge would operate against the subsidy. The public conscience has been aroused and its sense of propriety shocked by discoveries of frauds among the high financiers of the country. In a less degree in its universality, perhaps, but no less genuine in its sincerity, will be the sentiment of the people against this subsidy when they once comprehend it in all of its phases. If the Representatives of the people stand, as they do stand, against the crimes of frenzied finance, they should also stand against the great offenses of governmental preference and favoritism. If Representatives stand, as they do stand, against the wrongs of insurance companies, they should likewise stand against the wrongs of railway companies. The people expect us, amid all the waves of excitement and against all the pressure of influence, to uphold the right as we see it. For myself, against the opposition which my position on this subsidy brings upon me, I cheerfully appeal to the conscience and judgment of the people of North Carolina, who have never yet bowed to frenzied finance or surrendered to the legions of greed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the expediency and the necessity for a deep waterway from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico are most obvious, and this Congress should appropriate a

sum of money sufficient to enable the work to be pushed vigorously and steadily until a subsequent appropriation is available. In my opinion, Congress should authorize a continuous contract for the completion of this improvement. At any event, practical results should be secured.

Work on this great and beneficent project should begin at the earliest date possible and be continued uninterruptedly until completed. The work should be rushed, and no effort should be spared to complete it.

Mr. Chairman, we will never have a merchant marine such as our national wealth commands until ocean-going ships can sail into the heart of this continent, tie up at the wharves along this proposed route, and take on cargoes which can go unbroken to foreign markets.

I therefore believe, sir, that the Government should undertake earnestly the accomplishment of a project which will not only enable this to be done, but which will surely give to us that percentage of foreign business to which we are entitled.

Give the great Mississippi Valley a chance to get its products into the Latin-American countries by some cheap and direct means, such as this water route would afford, and we will not long be compelled to suffer the humiliation of permitting the international balance sheet to show a sum of \$500,000,000 annually against us in our transactions with those countries.

Europe to-day furnishes Latin America with upwards of three-fourths of all she consumes. We furnish the rest. We purchase from those countries, however, three-fifths of all they produce.

We can easily have the bulk of this trade if Congress will but extend this canal as proposed. The cheap transportation thus afforded will attract from the great West and Northwest a traffic simply stupendous. Enormous as the commerce of that section is to-day it can easily be doubled when the cost of transportation becomes reasonable. The great States of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota alone produce 26 per cent of the agricultural products of the United States and contain 19 per cent of its population. In these States there are 100,000 manufacturers, or 19 per cent of the number in the United States. In these institutions over \$600,000,000 are invested; a million of workmen are employed, who earn \$450,000,000 annually, or 16 per cent of all the wages paid in the United States—a good showing for five States out of forty-five, I respectfully submit.

It requires no strength of imagination, Mr. Chairman, to foresee the commercial benefits that will result from this improvement when the Panama Canal shall have been completed, and I have no doubt that it will be completed. The President asserts with great confidence and firmness that the canal will be built. Denial is therefore preposterous, and the roaring protests of certain turbulent demagogues will serve only to render its accomplishment more certain.

Mr. Chairman, all sections of this country should unite in an earnest effort to secure cheap transportation for carrying goods to and from the markets of foreign countries to the great sections of production of our own. The plain necessity for such action justifies the most lavish national exertion and expenditure even if pecuniary profit was our only object, which is not the case. When the Panama Canal is completed, commercial traffic with the Philippines, China, and Japan will afford an opportunity of introducing into those countries Christianity with its great rewards, which in itself is far more praiseworthy, and which will redound more to our glory as a nation than anything that can be gained by a satisfaction of our appetite for commercial greatness. While we are looking for foreign markets for the boundless resources of the prolific Mississippi Valley, let us not overlook an opportunity to teach the principles of Christian civilization.

Mr. Chairman, Europe can deliver the products of England, Germany, and France to points in Mexico and Central and South America at a cost three times less than we can deliver from our centers of production goods to the same points, simply because our exports and imports are largely controlled by railways whose rates are almost prohibitive. Under the present transportation system it costs, I am informed, something in the neighborhood of \$30 per ton on freight from the West to points in Latin America. If the proposed canal were in operation to-day, the same articles could be transported to Latin America for \$10 per ton, a difference of \$20. Let us free the people, gentlemen, by constructing this deep waterway. They have paid tribute to the railroads long enough.

Mr. Chairman, this country spends 95 per cent on its land transportation and only 5 per cent for sea carriage. Products valued at \$500,000,000 are annually imported into our country from South America in foreign bottoms, and we pay to these foreign ships \$30,000,000 for this service alone. How does it happen that the United States has to-day 1,500,000 less tonnage



on the seas than it had sixty-five years ago, and how long are we going to continue paying annually over five and one-half billion dollars for the transportation of passengers, mail, and freight around the world?

The building of this proposed deep waterway will correct the seeming indifference to me of the most commendable national enterprises. It will give an impetus to shipbuilding here in the United States such as was never before dreamed of. It will relieve the Interstate Commerce Commission of the further duty of railroad rate regulation, for it will certainly solve this most important question.

No railroad can charge higher freight rates than those made by a competing carrier and prosper. As proof of this assertion, permit me to call your attention to a part of the argument made by Mr. Frank J. Delaney, of Chicago, before the committee on appropriations of the forty-second general assembly of the State of Illinois, concerning the value of the Illinois and Michigan Canal to the farmers and shippers of the State and the effect upon freight rates.

Mr. Delaney's argument was in part as follows:

First. Freight rates (either water or rail) are markedly lower along the canal than at any other points in the State.

Second. That the low rail rates made by railways paralleling the canal force the nearest competing railroads on either side to make correspondingly low charges, though these roads may be miles distant from the canal proper, and that this influence is directly felt at a distance 40 or 50 miles either side of the canal.

Third (and it may be well to note this particularly). That the greater the distance from the canal the higher the freight rate, regardless of the distance from Chicago.

Assuming that the canal territory most directly influenced is the ter-

ritory to be considered we find that the very presence of the canal, regardless of the volume of business done upon its waters, has saved to farmers of this territory about \$1,500,000 in last year's crop of corn, oats, and wheat.

The following counties being what we will consider as "canal counties"—that is, those being the counties most directly and most noticeably influenced: Cook, Will, Dupage, Kane, Kendall, Grundy, DeKalb, Kankakee, Iroquois, Livingston, Woodford, Marshall, Lee, Bureau, Putnam, Stark, Peoria, and Tazewell.

These counties last year produced 973,340 bushels of wheat, 94,880,160 bushels of corn, and 65,579,274 bushels of oats. (Figures taken from report of 1899, Illinois State board of agriculture, computing corn at 40 bushels to the acre.)

A study of the various rates throughout this section and a reference to the rate map will show that the presence of the canal saves from 1½ cents to 4 cents in freight charges per hundred pounds on grain alone. Assuming, therefore, that the average saving of freight charges by this waterway is but 2 cents per hundred pounds—certainly a very conservative estimate—we find that this canal has saved to the farmers of this territory along during the last year approximately \$1,500,000, and by a sympathetic reduction of freights throughout its competitive influence many times that sum.

Of the amounts of grain mentioned we may assume that perhaps one-third of this went to market and paid freight, this receiving the actual tangible benefit of the canal in dollars and cents. The other portion of the grain raised was consumed at home and received its proportion of the saving indirectly, and its market value was the same as and its benefit equal to the grain actually marketed.

When we consider that this computation includes corn, wheat, and oats, only three of the many products of this territory, we can readily see the immense value this comparatively short waterway is to our State.

The following table, taken from the proceedings of a convention of the Upper Mississippi River Improvement Association, held in Dubuque, Iowa, in November of last year, shows a comparison of all-rail with all-water rates:

*A comparison of all rail with all water rates.*

[In cents per 100 pounds.]

	Miles.	Classes.									
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
St. Louis to Cairo, Ill., by water.....	151	0.34	0.29	0.24	0.19	0.14½	0.14	0.12	0.09½	0.08½	0.07½
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
St. Louis to Williamsville, Mo., by rail.....	145	0.65	0.58	0.49	0.39	0.25	0.22	0.18½	0.14	0.14	0.10

These rates are governed by two different classifications, but the Illinois to Cairo is the lower basis and makes the difference more pronounced than shown by the figures.

	Miles.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
St. Louis to St. Paul, Minn., by water.....	582	0.63	0.52½	0.42	0.26	0.21	0.26	0.21	0.18	0.15	0.13½
St. Louis to Oklahoma City, Okla., by rail.....	543	1.30	1.09	.97	.84	.67	.65	.53	.40	.37	.29

In this instance rates forced by water competition are less than half of the other.

	Miles.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
St. Louis to Hannibal, Mo., by water.....	130	0.28	0.22	0.17	0.12	0.09	0.11	0.10	0.09	0.07½	0.06½
St. Louis to Centralia, Mo., by rail.....	124	.47	.36	.26	.21	.16	.18	.15	.13	.11	.09

This comparison shows the effect on short hauls.

	Miles.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
East St. Louis to Peoria, Ill.....	159	0.25	0.20	0.16	0.12	0.11	0.10	0.09½	0.09	0.08½	0.07
East St. Louis to Green Valley, Ill.....	139	.4418	.3478	.2716	.2180	.1744	.1410	.1288	.1034	.0822	.0722

Green Valley is intermediate to Peoria on the C. and A.

	Miles.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	A.	B.	C.	D.
St. Louis to New Orleans, La., by water.....	703	0.90	0.75	0.65	0.50	0.40	0.35	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.20
St. Louis to Lauderdale, Miss., by rail.....	493	1.33	1.11	.95	.80	.62	.54	.41	.44	.33	.25

Lauderdale is intermediate to New Orleans on the M. and O. Rwy.

Instead of being detrimental I believe deep waterways to be essential adjuncts to successful railway operation, and I thoroughly believe, Mr. Chairman, that this proposed deep waterway would be a veritable boon to railroads contiguous thereto. It would stimulate business and take away from them freight of a nonproductive nature. All well-regulated waterway systems have benefited adjoining railroads. The best railroad authorities in our country recognize the fact that water competition, instead of being a detriment to the railroads, is a benefit to them. Railroads handle with small profit freight usually carried by water. If anyone doubts that this argument rests on a sound basis, let him study the contemporaneous development of

railroads and canals in France. In our own country the most prosperous railroads are those that parallel waterways.

A comparison of the stock lists of roads running to and from the seaports and lake ports with those of interior cities will satisfy any fair-minded man, it seems to me, of the truthfulness of this assertion. Take the New York stock quotations of this year. Note the roads whose securities are above par.

Railroads having competing waterways: Lake Shore and Michigan Southern, 200; Michigan Central, 200; Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, preferred, 174½; Chicago and Northwestern, preferred, 228½; Delaware and Hudson, 202½; New York Central, 145½; New York, New Haven and Hartford, 200½.

Railroads having no competing waterways: Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, preferred, 102; Baltimore and Ohio, 110½; Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis, 99; Chesapeake and Ohio, 57½; Atlantic and Pacific; Colorado Coal and Iron, 60½; Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific, 66½; New York, Lake Erie and Western, preferred; Denver and Rio Grande, 86½; Texas and Pacific, 34.

These quotations are self-explanatory and I do not care to make further argument in defense of my assertion that waterways benefit adjoining railroads. We are here to legislate for the people and not for the railroads. The railroads of this country, with their subsidies and land grants, are estimated to be worth between \$18,000,000,000 and \$19,000,000,000, and should be able to get on without further governmental assistance.

The Government has gone far enough, in my humble opinion, in bestowing favors upon great railroad corporations—favors which have no doubt been judiciously used for the betterment of the people. I make no complaint against Government land grants and subsidies to certain railroads. I think perhaps they were necessary and have proven beneficent. But the railroads need no further aid by way of subsidies from the Government.

The present transportation facilities are inadequate and wholly unsatisfactory. With present high freight rates, transshipments, etc., competition with other sections of our country, and more especially with foreign countries, is out of the question. That this, the richest territory on earth, embracing, as it does, half of the States in the Union, with a navigable river system of 20,000 miles, and possessing half of the nation's population, should have been so long denied a direct and economical means of transportation for its enormous commerce is a problem to solve which would require faculties I do not possess. Fairness demands that this section of our country, upon which the stability of the nation rests, should be given all Government aid possible to encourage it to increase its commercial supremacy. Men who are broad-minded enough to see the future greatness of the United States and who have the power of taking in the interests of the whole country realize fully the importance of speedy action on the part of the Government to the end that this commercial supremacy be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, the Mississippi Valley has an area of 1,350,000 square miles. It is 2,500 miles in length and 2,000 miles in width. Within its boundaries lie the greatest producing States in the Union; yea, in the world. The arms of its principal river reach out from east to west and, with the Missouri, form the boundary lines of twenty-one States and affords 20,000 miles of navigation.

What a splendid opportunity is here afforded by this proposed deep waterway to give to this section of our country, which has raised us from a debtor to a creditor nation, cheap transportation for its commerce to foreign markets. This great valley produces 75 per cent of all our foreign exports, only a small portion of which, however, finds a direct route to foreign markets. Commerce for export should go direct and in American bottoms. It is a shame, Mr. Chairman, that over 90 per cent of the export trade of this country is carried in foreign bottoms. Give to this fruitful region the cheap and necessary means of transportation, and a mighty impetus will be given to the shipbuilding industry. By no subsidies, save the expenditure by the Government of money in the permanent betterment of channels, an American merchant marine has grown up on the Great Lakes which excels the merchant marine of any foreign nation except England and Germany. Machinery for the rapid handling of cargoes, such as seen in no other part of the world, has been invented and placed in extensive use in lake transportation. The capacity of the ships in the active carrying of freight has been greatly increased, whereby cargoes of 100,000 bushels of grain are loaded within five hours and unloaded in six hours. Five thousand tons of ore are placed on shipboard within three hours, and the cargo is taken out in the light of a working day. Coal drops from car-dumping machines into the holds of vessels, and within three hours of the time they tie up to the dock they have on board from 3,000 to 5,000 tons and are ready to sail again. Vessel owners claim that nowhere in the world has the science of handling freight eco-

nomically and rapidly reached so high a state of perfection as in the lake service. The ships built at the shipyards during the present decade will compare favorably with vessels of the same class built anywhere in the world.

The marvelous development of Chicago is due largely to the fact that the city is located at the point where railroad transportation and water transportation meet. The growth of the city has been but the reflex of the development of the West, and the traffic of the West has come to Chicago because its products could be shipped at lower rate through the Chicago River than elsewhere.

It would be a reiteration of a familiar story and a waste of your time to urge the magnitude of Chicago's commerce and manufacturing. We might call your attention to the fact that this city is the largest railroad center in the world, that it holds the lead in many lines of manufacturing, and that as a primary market for grain it has no rival. Her position in the commercial, financial, and manufacturing life of the nation needs no detail of statistics. [Loud applause.]

I desire at this point, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the House to a table, prepared at the customs office at Chicago, which shows the lake commerce of Chicago for 1904, in order that some idea may be had of the great tonnage received and shipped from that port:

*Lake commerce of Chicago, 1904.*

RECEIVED.			
Coal	tons	1,024,853	
Iron ore	do	2,573,622	
Salt	barrels	1,526,859	
Lumber	M feet	402,839	
Shingles	do	20,796	
Lath	do	13,761	
Posts	number	1,051,083	
Ties	do	1,787,234	
Poles	do	113,165	
Wood	cords	9,996	
Plaster	barrels	84,098	
Cement	do	278,413	
Asphalt	do	24,657	
Sulphur	do	5,644	
Copper	bars	76,466	
Hides	bales	1,214	
Hardware	packages	399,083	
Shoes	do	368,079	
Sugar	do	1,478,305	
Groceries	tons	73,623	
Green fruits	packages	3,882,058	
Potatoes	bushels	180,320	
Coffee	sacks	127,364	
Grain	bushels	2,012,600	
Unclassified	tons	463,589	
Number of vessels entered		6,428	
Tonnage		6,325,092	

SHIPPED.			
Wheat	bushels	5,715,987	
Corn	do	41,864,828	
Oats	do	7,607,466	
Rye	do	237,000	
Barley	do	1,083,990	
Flaxseed	do	161,500	
Flour	barrels	1,535,439	
Cereals	do	70,523	
Mill stuffs	sacks	1,905,250	
Gluten meal	do	119,266	
Malt	do	114,973	
Oil cake	do	195,975	
Grass seed	do	36,589	
Glucose	barrels	67,104	
Sugar	do	30,010	
Oil	do	104,668	
Pork	do	7,142	
Tallow	do	23,853	
Hides	bales	4,898	
Wool and hair	sacks	35,087	
Broom corn	bales	1,249	
Spelter	plates	120,981	
Groceries	tons	7,110	
Manufactures of iron	do	20,989	
Unclassified	do	376,744	
Number of vessels cleared		6,476	
Tonnage		6,420,986	

The following tables, taken from the report of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago for the year ended December 31, 1904, and prepared by Hon. George F. Stone, its secretary, to whom I am indebted for the same, will serve to illustrate in part Chicago's great business for that year:

*Flour and Grain.—The entire movement of these products at Chicago during 1904.*

RECEIPTS.

	Flour.	Wheat.	Corn.	Oats.	Rye.	Barley.
	Barrels.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
Lake	7,880	495,000				
Canal	54,735	7,600		48,304		
Chicago and North western Railway	1,414,835	3,020,331	7,608,044	14,478,141	543,775	10,284,307
Illinois Central Railroad	295,353	1,453,525	25,679,700	9,492,700	75,200	976,800
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway	739,988	4,079,880	11,530,575	10,885,251	184,615	1,753,370
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railway	1,712,000	3,228,225	19,620,250	9,128,250	528,250	770,000
Chicago and Alton Railroad	481,426	1,038,595	9,740,900	2,561,750	23,200	8,800
Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railroad		65,900	5,724,900	3,168,250	8,000	



FLOUR AND GRAIN.—The entire movement of these products at Chicago during 1904.—Continued.

	Flour.	Wheat.	Corn.	Oats.	Rye.	Barley.
	<i>Borrels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway	1,689,500	3,796,845	4,047,200	12,807,100	551,100	9,819,850
Wabash Railroad (west of Chicago)	118,200	448,700	4,998,900	2,118,450	9,850	1,186,500
Chicago Great Western Railway	805,400	1,540,000	1,668,500	3,566,100	81,550	1,000
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway	313,539	4,207,800	5,549,250	2,194,850	33,000	249,768
Wisconsin Central Lines	1,042,421	535,834	2,100	271,670	28,250	78,100
Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway	112,073	401,650	3,477,450	1,996,750	229,132	181,572
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Railway	42,350	80,152	882,559	345,291	10,195	6,250
Eastern Lines <sup>a</sup>		19,310	55,645	10,262		
Total receipts	8,839,220	24,457,347	100,543,207	73,023,119	2,379,367	25,316,917
Flour manufactured in the city	750,000					
In store and afloat in harbor, December 31, 1903	17,700	2,768,291	2,244,068	1,227,728	242,279	271,310
Grand totals	9,606,920	27,225,638	102,787,275	74,250,847	2,621,646	25,588,228

## SHIPMENTS.

	<i>Barrels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
Lake—To Buffalo	511,743	5,179,787	23,202,205	4,226,578	237,000	863,181
To Erie	143,152	60,000	317,000			
To Ogdensburg	11,572		2,507,074	1,073,442		15,000
To Port Huron			1,190,200			
To other United States ports	27,492	385,969	933,115	30,800		
To Depot Harbor	7,210		3,371,446	478,850		116,800
To Montreal	290		1,822,474			89,000
To Midland			1,455,709	62,812		
To Collingwood	1,902		1,184,962	270,588		
To Kingston			217,600			
To Sarnia				554,863		
To other Canadian ports		1,600	516,176	943,554		
Totals by Lake	703,961	5,627,386	41,798,051	7,641,077	237,000	1,083,981
Canal	2,054	383,010		4,765		
Chicago and Northwestern Rwy	20,107	124,494	364,900	69,058	12,150	33,571
Illinois Central R. R.	35,894	307,500	140,950	234,300	6,650	202,400
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy	15,863	614,364	2,295,100	1,038,332		212,045
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy	6,600					
Chicago and Alton R. R.	1,350	177,338				
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.	8,850	103,950	349,000	85,350	2,000	39,300
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy	26,300	82,550	246,025	23,200	5,750	24,300
Wabash R. R. (west of Chicago)		33,900	4,000	4,350		19,800
Chicago Great Western Rwy	25,820		47,800	3,200		3,300
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Rwy						
Wisconsin Central lines	51,400	696,475	748,750	463,600	19,000	5,500
Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Rwy	236,239	578,463	586,561	604,871	392,169	405,815
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy	6,134,058	9,257,986	28,003,681	37,131,798	832,554	3,772,844
Eastern lines						
Total shipments	7,267,896	17,957,416	75,184,758	47,903,901	1,597,273	5,802,853
In store and afloat in harbor December 31, 1904	33,500	1,656,152	2,140,389	3,579,842	414,192	12,733
City consumption and unaccounted for	2,305,524	7,612,070	25,462,134	23,367,104	640,181	19,772,639
Grand totals	9,606,920	27,225,638	102,787,275	74,250,847	2,621,646	25,588,228

<sup>a</sup>The Eastern Lines include the Wabash R. R. (east of Chicago), C. C. & St. L. Rwy., Michigan Central R. R., L. S. & M. S. Rwy., P., Ft. W. & C. Rwy., P., C. & St. L. Rwy., B. & O. R. R., C. & G. T. Rwy., N. Y. C. & St. L. Rwy., and the Chicago and Erie R. R.

LIVE AND DRESSED HOGS.—Receipts and shipments during 1904.  
RECEIPTS.

	Live.	Dressed.
Chicago and Northwestern Rwy	1,798,314	19,511
Illinois Central R. R.	702,664	8
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy	994,208	276
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy	886,544	
Chicago and Alton R. R.	114,062	
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.	127,144	
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy	1,786,418	
Wabash R. R.	143,179	
Chicago Great Western Rwy	257,213	
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe R. R.	174,861	
Wisconsin Central Lines	53,894	
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy	46,269	39
Michigan Central R. R.	23,041	
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Rwy	11,981	
Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago Rwy	12,623	
Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rwy	30,580	
Baltimore and Ohio R. R.	4,709	
Chicago and Grand Trunk Rwy	19,283	
New York, Chicago and St. Louis R. R.	13,761	
Chicago and Erie R. R.	19,500	
Pere Marquette R. R.	16,357	
Chicago Junction R. R.	457	
Eastern Lines		190
Driven into yards	1,794	
Total live	7,238,746	
Total dressed		20,024
Total live and dressed		7,258,770

## SHIPMENTS.

	Live.	Dressed.
Chicago and Northwestern Rwy	13,671	8
Illinois Central R. R.	978	22
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy	251	
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy		
Chicago and Alton R. R.	95	30
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.	966	
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy	9,851	
Wabash R. R.	470	
Chicago Great Western Rwy	29	
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe R. R.		
Wisconsin Central Lines		
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy	6,051	207

LIVE AND DRESSED HOGS.—Receipts and shipments during 1904.—Cont'd.  
SHIPMENTS—continued.

	Live.	Dressed.
Michigan Central R. R.	226,049	
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Rwy	749,448	
Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago Rwy	271,004	
Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rwy	111,187	
Baltimore and Ohio R. R.	149,161	
Chicago and Grand Trunk Rwy	4,864	
New York, Chicago and St. Louis R. R.	50,449	
Chicago and Erie R. R.	31,324	
Pere Marquette R. R.	174	
Chicago Junction R. R.		
Eastern Lines		120,372
Total live	1,626,022	
Total dressed		120,845
Total live and dressed		1,746,867
City consumption and packing	6,156,724	

## By months during 1904.

## RECEIPTS.

	Live.	Dressed.
	Number.	Average weight.
January	869,814	206
February	845,894	205
March	612,141	206
April	558,122	208
May	580,014	214
June	577,138	221
July	349,558	226
August	502,465	239
September	356,264	244
October	477,217	230
November	705,440	232
December	804,679	228
Total receipts, live	7,238,746	
Total receipts, dressed		20,024
Total live and dressed		7,258,770

By months during 1904—Continued.  
SHIPMENTS.

	Live.	Dressed.
January.....	159,542	19,258
February.....	180,529	16,552
March.....	236,375	10,069
April.....	188,002	11,433
May.....	143,597	12,932
June.....	105,838	5,888
July.....	97,778	3,675
August.....	123,163	5,065
September.....	98,076	4,140
October.....	83,131	6,835
November.....	106,885	10,245
December.....	102,106	13,955

Total shipments, live.....

Total shipments, dressed.....

Total live and dressed.....

City consumption and packing.....

CATTLE AND SHEEP.—Receipts and shipments of these varieties of live stock during 1904.  
[As reported by the Union Stock Yards Company.]

RECEIPTS.

	Cattle.	Sheep.
Chicago and Northwestern Rwy.....	669,924	1,087,752
Illinois Central R. R.....	258,165	140,452
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy.....	323,317	246,320
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy.....	739,069	882,108
Chicago and Alton R. R.....	173,409	64,403
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.....	65,358	93,806
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy.....	601,905	1,260,314
Wabash R. R.....	107,821	68,858
Chicago Great Western Rwy.....	114,566	214,674
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe R. R.....	119,274	47,532
Wisconsin Central lines.....	18,927	192,810
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy.....	28,898	111,288
Michigan Central R. R.....	4,875	15,975
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Rwy.....	2,391	19,825
Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago Rwy.....	2,748	14,028
Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rwy.....	13,416	30,900
Baltimore and Ohio R. R.....	1,344	7,074
Chicago and Grand Trunk Rwy.....	2,517	13,580
New York, Chicago and St. Louis R. R.....	2,787	15,288
Chicago and Erie R. R.....	1,548	10,518
Pere Marquette R. R.....	2,012	6,300
Chicago Junction Rwy.....	464	825
Driven into yards.....	3,890	825
Total.....	3,259,185	4,504,630

SHIPMENTS.

Chicago and Northwestern Rwy.....	42,062	19,734
Illinois Central R. R.....	30,513	36,459
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy.....	24,957	11,808
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy.....	55,889	16,079
Chicago and Alton R. R.....	11,287	13,189
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.....	29,815	41,598
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy.....	28,853	33,451
Wabash R. R.....	32,298	29,147
Chicago Great Western Rwy.....	2,396	3,496
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe R. R.....	13,971	3,505
Wisconsin Central lines.....	1,738	4,440
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy.....	20,172	33,121
Michigan Central R. R.....	226,547	81,851
Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Rwy.....	172,734	270,637
Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago Rwy.....	225,529	363,423
Pittsburg, Cincinnati, Chicago and St. Louis Rwy.....	65,507	61,090
Baltimore and Ohio R. R.....	88,752	92,764
Chicago and Grand Trunk Rwy.....	186,463	132,571
New York, Chicago and St. Louis R. R.....	17,538	22,999
Chicago and Erie R. R.....	36,088	78,215
Pere Marquette R. R.....	3,438	12,753
Chicago Junction Rwy.....	9,847	.....
Total.....	1,326,332	1,362,270
City consumption and packing.....	1,932,853	3,142,360

CATTLE AND SHEEP.—Receipts and shipments of these varieties of live stock by months during 1904.  
[As reported by the Union Stock Yards Company.]

RECEIPTS.

	Cattle.	Sheep.
January.....	293,300	355,926
February.....	285,704	431,612
March.....	261,076	374,680
April.....	246,299	301,301
May.....	236,647	288,571
June.....	267,681	332,442
July.....	154,525	216,945
August.....	272,569	420,746
September.....	277,068	466,951
October.....	362,376	574,694
November.....	338,987	422,450
December.....	282,622	318,312
Total.....	3,259,185	4,504,630

CATTLE AND SHEEP.—Receipts and shipments of these varieties of live stock by months during 1904—Continued.

SHIPMENTS.

	Cattle.	Sheep.
January.....	111,409	63,110
February.....	107,592	93,769
March.....	117,442	103,897
April.....	107,867	51,334
May.....	96,483	45,438
June.....	93,755	31,043
July.....	74,155	93,983
August.....	116,419	224,019
September.....	126,341	239,701
October.....	132,335	251,401
November.....	118,823	97,473
December.....	120,711	67,104
Total.....	1,326,332	1,362,270
City consumption and packing.....	1,932,853	3,142,360

HIDES AND WOOL.—Receipts and shipments of these products during 1904, by routes.

	Hides.		Wool.	
	Received.	Shipped.	Received.	Shipped.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.
Lake.....	39,200	2,914,000	20,000	8,850,700
Canal.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago and Northwestern Rwy.....	79,743,959	26,407,932	22,668,702	2,114,210
Illinois Central R. R.....	7,463,870	2,247,488	7,098,291	167,200
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy.....	13,159,664	993,804	10,750,069	183,016
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy.....	20,475,398	943,012	18,289,953	783,048
Chicago and Alton R. R.....	17,462,297	16,000	56,770	17,000
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy.....	.....	.....	9,064,600	.....
Wabash R. R. (west of Chicago).....	5,555,940	.....	3,020,424	.....
Chicago Great Western Rwy.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe R. R.....	2,510,442	.....	126,000	.....
Wisconsin Central lines.....	8,151,280	.....	87,465	.....
Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Rwy.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy.....	6,296,102	13,266,270	1,559,536	1,823,140
Eastern lines.....	4,881,698	150,590,745	586,220	59,378,185
Total.....	165,739,850	197,469,251	72,693,060	73,316,559

TIMOTHY AND CLOVER SEEDS.—Receipts and shipments of these commodities during 1904, by routes.

	Timothy seed.		Clover seed.	
	Received.	Shipped.	Received.	Shipped.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.
Lake.....	.....	732,368	.....	19,040
Canal.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago and Northwestern Rwy.....	5,944,699	223,060	185,489	200,572
Illinois Central R. R.....	4,130,893	221,800	1,886,149	112,407
Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Rwy.....	12,625,885	.....	158,485	170,000
Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Rwy.....	8,954,255	.....	693,671	80,238
Chicago and Alton R. R.....	168,660	.....	415,961	24,000
Chicago and Eastern Illinois R. R.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Rwy.....	13,500,000	.....	280,000	.....
Wabash R. R. (west of Chicago).....	80,000	.....	.....	.....
Chicago Great Western Rwy.....	14,100,049	.....	.....	.....
Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe R. R.....	105,000	.....	.....	.....
Wisconsin Central lines.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Rwy.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chicago, Indianapolis and Louisville Rwy.....	2,217,181	2,702,285	2,756,905	1,367,975
Eastern lines.....	163,250	21,607,000	1,543,495	4,268,336
Total.....	61,989,872	25,486,513	7,920,245	6,242,568

These figures serve to show in part the greatness of the commerce of Chicago and the surrounding country and how important a part they are of the commerce of the nation.

The great city of Chicago, cognizant of the future commercial greatness of the West and Northwest and realizing the imperative future necessity of a ship canal from Lake Michigan to the Gulf of Mexico, burdened itself by taxation to the amount of \$18,000,000 in excess of what was necessary to build a canal for drainage purposes alone, as was originally contemplated.

This, in many respects the greatest engineering project ever undertaken, renders the continuation by the Government of a deep waterway to the Gulf of Mexico exceedingly easy and inexpensive. Some idea of its magnitude and importance may be had by a perusal of a memorial recently presented to the Con-



gress of the United States by the trustees of the sanitary district of Chicago, the following extracts of which I desire to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of Members desiring to enlighten themselves upon this great subject:

#### THE CHICAGO SANITARY AND SHIP CANAL.

The Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal may well be called the greatest artificial waterway ever constructed, and in its character of a navigable channel it stands ready to hand for the benefit of the Federal Government as a complete and in every respect satisfactory section of a deep waterway from Lake Michigan to the Mississippi River. It is, indeed, because of this character of the Sanitary and Ship Canal, and because it was designed for such ultimate use, that your memorialists, who have had its construction in their charge, are able to address you as parties deeply interested in the development of the waterway.

Before describing the inception and construction of the canal in detail it is well to point out again the place it fills in the general plan. It cuts through the divide between the Chicago River and the headwaters of the Desplaines, which is, by far, the most difficult and expensive portion of the entire work of construction. Its cost, when completed, will be close to \$55,000,000, more than double the amount which will be necessary, as figures to be presented later will show, for the entire remainder of the work. It carries a volume of water large enough to furnish a steady supply for a waterway 14 feet deep, from its commencement at Chicago to the Mississippi River at St. Louis. To give it this capacity at least \$18,000,000 more was spent upon it than would have been necessary to meet the demands of its use for sanitation alone.

The Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal was, as has been said, primarily constructed for the disposal of the sewage of the city of Chicago, which had previously passed into Lake Michigan, polluting the water supply of the city. Notwithstanding this use of the canal, it is not to be thought that it is an unpleasant stream. So great is the volume of water provided that the canal is clear and odorless, and, in fact, in better condition hygienically than the ordinary river flowing through an inhabited country.

The construction of the canal was authorized by State law May 29, 1889, and the sanitary district of Chicago was organized for the work, its territory including all that part of Chicago lying north of Eighty-seventh street, with the exception of two small outlying suburbs, and 43 square miles of Cook County outside of the city limits. Its total area is 185 square miles. The district is 18 miles long from north to south and 9½ miles wide on a line east and west through the city hall. Its extreme width is 15 miles.\* The nine trustees to whom the control of the district was given were authorized to levy taxes to the extent of one-half of 1 per cent per annum on the assessed valuation of the property of the district; and for the five years from 1895 to 1899 they were allowed a tax rate of 1½ per cent. They were also empowered to issue bonds to the amount of 5 per cent of the taxable property of the district, with the provision that that amount should not exceed \$15,000,000, a limitation which in 1901 was raised to \$20,000,000 to enable further improvement of the Chicago River. The total bond issue to date has been \$24,790,000, of which amount \$17,565,000 is still outstanding. The total income of the district from taxes to date has been \$27,950,766.38.

The first board of trustees of the district, elected December 12, 1889, consisted of John J. Altpeter, Arnold P. Gilmore, Christoph Hotz, John A. King, Murry Nelson, Richard Prendergast, William H. Russell, Frank Wenter, and Henry J. Willing. Trustees Hotz, King, Nelson, and Willing resigned early in their terms, however, and in their places William Boldenweck, Lyman E. Cooley, Bernard A. Eckhart, and Thomas Kelly were elected.

The second board of trustees, elected November 5, 1895, included Trustees Boldenweck, Eckhart, Kelly, and Wenter, of the former board, and the following new members: Joseph C. Braden, Zina R. Carter, Alexander J. Jones, James P. Mallette, and Thomas A. Smyth.

November 6, 1900, the present board of trustees was elected, Trustees Braden, Carter, Jones, Smyth, and Wenter being returned, and William H. Baker, Frank X. Cloldt, William Legner, and Thomas J. Webb taking the places of retired members.

The presidents of the board have been:

Murry Nelson, February 1, 1890, to December 2, 1890.

Richard Prendergast, December 2, 1890, to December 8, 1891.

Frank Wenter, December 8, 1891, to December 3, 1895.

Bernard A. Eckhart, December 3, 1895, to December 8, 1896.

Thomas Kelly, December 8, 1896, to December 7, 1897.

William Boldenweck, December 7, 1897, to December 4, 1900.

Alexander J. Jones, December 4, 1900, to December 3, 1901.

Thomas A. Smyth, December 3, 1901, to December 8, 1903.

Zina R. Carter, December 8, 1903.

Ground was broken for the work of excavation September 3, 1892. Trustee Wenter, then president of the board, throwing the first shovelful of earth. From that time forward the work was pushed in the face of every obstacle, and at times with a rapidity hitherto unknown in channel digging; as, for example, when in a single month, August, 1894, 1,291,688 cubic yards of glacial drift and 413,164 yards of solid rock were excavated. Many new methods were introduced for the gigantic task, and schemes of a boldness fitting the great enterprise were adopted. Finally, after more than seven years of work, the canal and enough of the coordinated works were finished to make it possible to begin to put it to use. January 2, 1900, the water of the Chicago River was turned into the channel, and fifteen days later the gates at the lower end were opened, and for the first time in centuries the water of the lake began to flow toward the Gulf of Mexico.

The canal proper is, as now being extended, 32.3 miles long, but in addition 6 miles of the Chicago River and 2½ miles of the Desplaines River have been improved by the district, so that the stretch of water over which control has been formally assumed, in accordance with the law, is 40.55 miles long. The Chicago River has become an uninterrupted part of the channel, with even better navigable depth than the canal proper, while the Desplaines has only been improved sufficiently to answer the sanitary purposes of the canal.

The Chicago River, prior to the opening of the canal, was a short and deep stream, branching to the north and to the south a mile back from the lake. With little fall, and small sources of supply excepting the water poured into it from many sewers, it was almost stagnant. As its dock lines had never been carefully preserved, its banks were

\* By an act of the legislature of the State of Illinois in the year 1903, 78.6 square miles of territory to the north were added to the corporate limits of the original sanitary district and 94.5 square miles to the south. The present total area is now 358.1 square miles and 38 miles long from north to south.

irregular, the bed varying greatly in width at different places. The problem which the sanitary district had to face was the enlarging of this river so that it would provide a sufficient volume of water for the needs of the canal without producing a current injurious to navigation. This was accomplished in the first instance by dredging to a depth of 20 feet (except over tunnels), and by the construction of two by-passes or conduits, with dimensions of 16 by 50 feet, on the west side of the river from Monroe to Van Buren streets, where the channel was narrowest. Several of the most obstructive center-pier bridges were also removed.

Later on, however, after the water was turned into the canal, in 1900, a systematic study of river improvement to meet the needs of navigation was made, and the district by ordinance adopted a policy which provided for the widening of the river to 200 feet and its deepening to 26 feet through the entire length used in securing water supply. At the same time a depth of 30 feet was indicated as ultimately desirable. Under the ordinance condemnation proceedings have been begun for all the necessary land which could not be secured by purchase, and dredging, piling and docking have been going on simultaneously at many points. At the same time plans have been made to remove all of the center-pier bridges in the river, and substitute bascule bridges for them. Some of these bridges are already finished, others in process of construction, and the remainder will be contracted for as rapidly as it is possible without interfering too seriously with traffic on the streets. The estimate for the total cost of this work is \$9,000,000. At this writing, June, 1904, about 42 per cent of it has been finished. The completion of this work is dependent upon the rapidity with which the courts will handle the necessary condemnation suits. With all of the property in the possession of the district, the construction work could be completed in two years. With the completion of the work under these plans, the Chicago River will be a perfect navigable stream, of a uniform depth of 26 feet, saving only for the presence of three street railway tunnels, the removal of which is certain to come in the near future, but must await the action of either the city of Chicago or the Federal Government.

The Sanitary and Ship Canal proper begins at the west fork of the south branch of the Chicago River at Robey street, and extends 28.05 miles to Lockport. The depth of water in it varies with the flow, but the construction is such that under no conditions will the minimum be less than 22 feet. The present depth is between 24 and 25 feet. The channel is cut part of the way through glacial drift and part of the way through rock.

From Robey street to Summit, a distance of nearly 8 miles, the channel is 110 feet wide at the bottom and 198 feet wide at the water line. This part of the channel is cut through soil which permits easy dredging while the channel is in use, and for this reason it was not given its full capacity at the start, but left for enlargement as needs require. From Summit to Willow Springs, something over 5 miles farther, the channel is cut through earth with much hard material mixed in it, and it has the full planned dimensions, being 202 feet wide at the bottom and 290 feet at the water line. From Willow Springs to Lockport, 15 miles, the channel is through rock, and is 160 feet wide at the bottom and 162 feet at the water line. The average depth of the trough cut through the rock in this section is 35 feet. The grade of the channel is 1½ inches to the mile through the earth sections, and 3¼ inches to the mile through the rock section. The bottom of the channel at Robey street is 24.448 feet below Chicago datum, the datum being reckoned from low water in Lake Michigan in 1847. At Lockport the bottom of the channel is 30.1 feet below datum.

At Lockport there is in the canal a large windage basin, cut in the stone to enable large vessels to turn around. Here also are the controlling works, by means of which the flow of water in the canal is governed. These works consist of seven sluice gates of metal with masonry bulkheads, and one bear-trap dam. The sluice gates have a vertical play of 20 feet and openings of 30 feet each. The bear-trap dam has an opening of 160 feet and an oscillation of 17 feet vertically. This dam is essentially two great metal leaves, hinged together and working between masonry bulkheads. The downstream leaf is securely hinged to a heavy foundation, and the raising or lowering of the dam is accomplished by the admission or discharge of water through regulating valves. The dam is regarded as one of the greatest engineering triumphs of the age.

From Lockport to the southern limits of Joliet, 6½ miles, the work of the sanitary district consisted in the deepening, widening, and leveling of the Desplaines River, so that it will accommodate a flow of 1,500,000 cubic feet of water a minute. This capacity provides both for the flow from the sanitary canal and for all possible flood waters of the Desplaines Valley. No attempt was made in this part of the work to establish the navigable depth, which was one of the primary considerations in the plans from Chicago to Lockport.

There is now, however, under construction by the sanitary district on this section a work of water-power development which, when it is completed, will afford a 22-foot channel for 3.3 miles and a 10-foot channel for 1 mile, the two covering over half of the entire distance. This water power, created by the heavy declivity of 52 feet in 8 miles on this section, is exceedingly valuable, the gross tolls possible from it being estimated on different methods of development at from \$628,150 to \$1,086,300 a year. The cost of the development will be \$3,000,000. Besides the power now being developed below Lockport the district will, as soon as it can acquire the necessary property, develop a second power near the southerly limits of the city of Joliet. This second power will afford about 18,000 net horsepower with the full flow of the channel. This is called the Hickory Creek development, and the building of the dam necessary for its accomplishment will afford nearly a mile of waterway about 13 feet in depth.

The flow of water which the canal is designed to accommodate is 600,000 cubic feet per minute. In its present condition the canal will not, however, admit this volume in all parts without producing a current harmful to navigation. The narrow section of the canal between Robey street and Summit will carry only 300,000 cubic feet at a current of a mile and a quarter an hour. The Chicago River will, as yet, handle little over 300,000 cubic feet; but a flow of 480,000 cubic feet will be possible when the work now under way is finished, while an additional volume of 120,000 cubic feet will be supplied through a large conduit to the Lake along Thirty-ninth street. The actual flow of water in the Chicago River is regulated in accordance with the orders of the Secretary of War. At present the flow permitted is 250,000 cubic feet per minute. With the progress of improvements in the river the increase of the permissible flow is to be expected.

The building of the canal involved the construction or alteration of many bridges, and in this, as in every part of the work, the needs of navigation were always kept in mind. The bridges are all either of the swing or rolling lift type, and the district boasts some of the largest

lift bridges ever constructed. One of the railway bridges has space for eight tracks. Thirty-seven bridges have already been built or contracted for, and there are many more to be placed across the Chicago River. The following table shows their distribution on different parts of the channel:

*Bridges across the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.*

	Highway.	Railroad.
Chicago River	9	1
Main channel	6	7
Desplaines River	2	4
Controlling works	1	—
Joliet project	5	2
Total	23	14

The distribution of the construction expenditures is shown in the following table:

*Statement of expenditures, account construction of main channel of sanitary district of Chicago and auxiliary work to June 1, 1904.*

	Excavation, etc.	Bridges.
Main channel excavation, etc.	\$18,499,136.15	—
Bridge construction, main channel	—	\$1,975,114.73
Chicago River dredging, docking, etc.	1,744,514.71	—
Bridge construction, Chicago River	—	1,944,629.02
River diversion, excavation, etc.	1,000,186.38	—
Bridge construction, river division	—	142,391.94
Controlling works at Lockport	330,560.73	—
Bridge construction, controlling works	—	7,873.35
Joliet project excavation, etc.	1,285,760.98	—
Bridge construction, Joliet project	—	271,161.66
Illinois and Michigan Canal improvement near Bridgeport	77,016.08	—
Water power development	71,191.17	—
Thirty-ninth street pumping plant	45,930.00	—
Total	23,054,356.20	4,341,170.70 23,054,353.20 27,395,526.90

Of the total cost \$18,000,000 at least would have been saved had the channel been made merely sufficient for the needs of sanitation, and not built with a view to the creation in the future of a deep waterway. The additional cost in the one matter of bridges alone, to make them all movable, so that they would not hinder navigation, was close to \$2,500,000.

To make the immensity of the work done by the sanitary district all the clearer the following table of the quantities involved in the construction work, completed and under contract, as taken from the 1903 report of the chief engineer, is presented:

*Quantities involved in the construction of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal.*

	Earth.	Rock.	Masonry.	Metal in bridges.
	<i>Cu. yds.</i>	<i>Cu. yds.</i>	<i>Cu. yds.</i>	<i>Pounds.</i>
Chicago River	3,209,946	4,473	59,695	21,091,490
Main channel	26,692,773	12,265,442	421,965	22,862,454
Desplaines River diversion	1,810,652	258,659	1,447	2,006,785
Controlling works	—	10,111	11,454	100,161
Joliet project	593,130	598,483	22,911	3,956,654
Water-power development	105,000	1,273,689	144,504	—
Total	32,411,501	14,410,857	661,976	50,006,524

#### DESCRIPTION AND ESTIMATES OF THE PROJECTED DEEP WATERWAY.

Having described the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal as a complete section of a deep waterway to the Mississippi, and having shown that from it the full flow of water necessary to the waterway can be secured, your memorialists wish to point out one further fact in connection with it before proceeding to discuss in detail the projected improvement of the route. This is, that the Sanitary and Ship Canal is itself a most powerful engineering aid to the further work which must be undertaken. Considered as a mere instrument for the scouring of the bed of the Illinois River, the flow of water from the sanitary canal is worth millions of dollars, because it will save millions that would otherwise have to be spent. In broad rivers, such as is the Illinois for the greater part of its course, there is a tendency to alluvial deposits, and a large volume of water scours the channel and keeps it clear. The water from the sanitary canal thus becomes a force so powerful that engineers will take it into account from the very beginning of their reckonings. The full flow of 600,000 cubic feet of water per minute, possible in the Sanitary and Ship Canal, is one-half the volume in the Mississippi River at Rock Island during the low-water season. Its discharge into the Mississippi from the mouth of the Illinois at Grafton will therefore materially increase the volume of the Father of Waters for a great part of the year. It follows that, even below Grafton, in the Mississippi itself, the water from the Sanitary and Ship Canal will be an important aid in the engineering operations necessary for the establishment of permanent deep-water navigation.

From Lake Michigan at Chicago to St. Louis, following the water route, is 362 miles. Of this distance the Sanitary and Ship Canal has already fully developed 34 miles. There are 286 miles of the Desplaines and Illinois rivers to be improved, and the Mississippi River section covers 39 miles.

When the deep-waterway survey which your honorable body has authorized is completed, you will be in possession of full information as to the work which must be done and the expenses which must be incurred. Pending that time, it is nevertheless possible, as a result

of preliminary surveys and estimates made on behalf of this sanitary district and of other organizations interested in the establishment of a deep waterway, to give figures and estimates that are close to the truth.

These estimates are made on the basis of a 22-foot channel from Chicago to Lake Joliet and a 14-foot channel from that point to the mouth of the Illinois. The 14-foot figure is chosen because it is that depth for which the sanitary and ship canal provides the necessary flow of water. An estimate of the cost of establishing a 14-foot channel from the mouth of the Illinois to St. Louis is also given, though it does not pretend to the same accuracy as the other estimates.

The characteristics of the river valley from the lower end of the Sanitary and Ship Canal to the Mississippi are of such nature that the distance can well be divided into three sections, requiring different methods of development and varying greatly in probable expense. The following table shows the main facts for these sections, as well as for the Sanitary and Ship Canal and for the Mississippi River as far as St. Louis.

Sections of the proposed waterway.	Length.	Declivity.	Minimum depth.	Number of levels.	Cost to January 1, 1904.
Chicago River and Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Chicago to Lockport	Miles. 34	Feet. 24	Feet. 22	1	\$42,503,168.80
Desplaines and Illinois rivers: Lockport to Lake Joliet.	8	52	22	2	\$5,000,000.00
Lake Joliet to Utica	54	66	14	3	10,000,000.00
Utica to mouth of Illinois	227	32	14	1	7,000,000.00
Mississippi River, mouth of Illinois to St. Louis	39	21	14	2	5,000,000.00
Total for sections dependent on Government action	328	171	—	8	27,000,000.00

Exclusive of the \$3,000,000 which the sanitary district is about to spend on this section.

A discussion of the work still remaining to be done in order to secure such a deep waterway will now be given.

#### THE JOLIET SECTION—LOCKPORT TO LAKE JOLIET.

A depth of 22 feet, rather than of 14 feet, is dictated on the Lockport-Lake Joliet section of the proposed waterway, partly because the water-power development plans of the sanitary district will produce that depth for over half of the distance, and partly because, where the channel must be cut through rock, that depth will furnish the most economical method of handling the volume of water required on the lower reaches of the waterway. The sanitary district's water power plans have been carefully made with a view to future waterway construction, and the dams to be built will furnish no obstacles whatever. Two locks will be required. A location has been provided for a lock at the upper dam, giving a lift of about 34 feet. For the lower lock a location is set apart on the west side of the river. The locks must be large enough to handle whole fleets of barges and tugs.

The construction of the deep waterway on this section is the most difficult and expensive, mile for mile, that is required on any portion of the route. The total cost is estimated at \$8,000,000, of which, as has been said, the sanitary district is preparing to spend \$3,000,000, or about half of the primary cost of cutting the channel proper through the rock. The additional cost is required for the two great locks. An expenditure of \$5,000,000 will, it is thought, be ample for the Government's share of the work, and it has been frequently suggested that the State of Illinois construct this section by prison labor from the penitentiary at Joliet, through which city the course runs.

#### THE UPPER ILLINOIS SECTION—LAKE JOLIET TO UTICA.

The 54 miles of the river immediately below Lake Joliet are much more easily handled from an engineering standpoint. The level of Lake Joliet is 76 feet below Lake Michigan, and the fall of 66 feet from this to the Utica level of 142 feet below the lake is made in a series of pools and rapids, according to the nature of the resisting strata. The three pools—Lake Joliet, Lake Du Page, and the pool above Marseilles—cover about one-third of the distance. There is a well-defined outlet valley and a developed stream bed, deeply cut for the greater part of the way. The distance between banks is from 500 to 700 feet. The tributary watershed varies from 6,400 square miles, at the mouth of the Kankakee, to 10,400 square miles at Utica, and gives rise to floods which come in part during the season of navigation. There are no artificial obstructions, except the mill dam at Marseilles, but six highway and three railroad bridges will require alteration.

The studies thus far made indicate the possibility of a proper treatment without injury to any great area of bottom lands. Lake Joliet, at the upper end of this section, is 5 miles long, and needs nothing but the cutting away of deposits in the shape of narrow gravel bars to insure the proper depth. In the rapids, the considerable declivity and consequent velocity make necessary a large and deep channel in the interests of navigation. Studies thus far made have proceeded for a depth of 14 feet and a width of 300 feet. Three levels or pools will be necessary, and three dams or locks. A 14-foot channel, with locks designed for an ultimate depth of 20 feet, can be secured, it is estimated, for \$10,000,000.

#### THE LOWER ILLINOIS—UTICA TO THE MOUTH OF THE ILLINOIS.

The problem of river improvement changes entirely again after Utica is passed. From that city southward, the Illinois is an alluvial stream with a declivity so small as to be almost unique among American rivers, amounting to only 28 feet in the natural river, and only 32 feet from the level of the pool formed by the Henry dam at Utica bridge to the low-water line of the Mississippi. The stream bed is from 600 to 900 feet wide, and some 700 square miles of bottom lands are subject to overflow, the situation being complicated by backwater from the Mississippi, which at extreme high water is on a level with natural low water 30 miles below Utica. The banks are low, averaging not more than 12 to 14 feet above low water. There are four dams and locks, two built by the State at Henry and Copperas Creek and two by the United States at La Grange and Kampsville on this section.

Experience in dredging the sand bars showed a reasonable perma-



nence in results, even with the smaller volumes of water, before the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal was opened, but the volume was not sufficient to maintain a channel more than 4 to 6 feet deep. In the last two years, since the sanitary canal was opened, it has been possible to maintain a channel 7 feet deep and 200 feet wide, except at the mouth of the Illinois, without great trouble. When the full flow of 10,000 cubic feet a second passes out of the canal, this depth will be increased without further dredging. It is easy to see what a great effect this volume of water will have on the channel, for it is sixteen times greater than that of natural low water at La Salle, and eight times greater than at the mouth of the Illinois. It is a very appreciable quantity, even in comparison with bankfull figures, 12 feet above low water, which official measurements before the opening of the sanitary canal showed to be 18,000 to 22,000 cubic feet per second from Utica to Havana, 30,000 cubic feet at La Grange, and 40,000 cubic feet at Kampsville. The average low-water flow at the present time may be placed at about 5,000 cubic feet.

The problem, therefore, becomes the creation of an additional depth of 7 feet, and this can be secured for the most part by cheap hydraulic dredging. It is estimated that 70,000,000 yards would have to be removed, but for all of it there can be found easy places of deposit on the back channels, sloughs, and marshes near the banks, to the benefit of the bottoms. A channel 300 feet wide and 14 feet deep can be secured, it is believed, at a cost not to exceed \$7,000,000. This does not make allowance for the aid which the scouring action of the augmented volume of the stream would give to the project, nor does it take into account economies in methods, which could be introduced on a work undertaken on so large a scale. For the \$7,000,000 it is thought that practically 100,000,000 yards instead of 70,000,000 yards could be handled, and the channel could be made larger by just that proportion.

#### THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER, GRAFTON TO ST. LOUIS.

No detailed studies have been made as yet for this section of the route, but there is no reason to doubt that a 14-foot channel could be maintained. Of the 39 miles, with their total fall of 21 feet, the first 20 miles to Alton have a fall of only 7 feet, and by the establishment of a dam at that city, raising low water perhaps 10 feet, the extension of deep water to this point would be comparatively easy.

The next 19 miles have a fall of 14 feet, and the situation is complicated by the entrance of the Missouri. If the deepening of the channel should prove difficult it would still be quite possible to carry deep-water navigation to St. Louis Harbor by a short canal, and by developing channels behind Chouteau and Cabaret islands.

A deep waterway over this route could probably be kept open the entire year, for ice is much less of an obstruction to navigation on such a channel than on the Great Lakes. Records kept at Morris, on the upper Illinois, show an ice season of sixty to seventy days, as against one hundred and twenty to one hundred and forty days on the lake routes from Chicago to Buffalo. Possibly in two-thirds of the years ice would offer no obstruction at all to river navigation, while in the other years ice boats would easily keep navigation open.

The total estimate of the cost of all of these improvements from Lockport to St. Louis is \$27,000,000, exclusive of what the sanitary district is to spend. While the estimates given are in some cases very liberal, it is not to be assumed that the total cost will be less than this amount; but it will certainly not greatly exceed it. Moreover, the channel may be put in use for navigation long before the entire amount is spent. The first 8 miles from Lockport to Lake Joliet would have to be completed as a whole at the outset. Lower down three locks and dams would also have to be finished to their final capacity before the opening of the deep waterway. The rest of the work could, however, be carried on at leisure afterwards, the prism of the river being progressively developed from year to year.

If a depth of 20 feet for the entire way is desired it would be perfectly possible to secure it without excessive additional cost. It would, however, be necessary to enlarge the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, so as to provide at least double the volume of water it is now capable of carrying. The extension of a 20-foot channel from Lake Joliet to Utica would involve only a fraction of the cost of a 14-foot channel, while a 20-foot depth in the lower Illinois is simply a matter of water supply and dredging. The large volume of water would be here necessary as an insurance against deterioration. The total additional cost which a 20-foot channel instead of a 14-foot channel from Lockport to St. Louis would involve is roughly placed at \$60,000,000.

A 20-foot channel in the Illinois valley is, however, not advocated by your memorialists as an affair of the present, because its full utilization would depend upon the establishment of a similar depth in the lower Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico. As conditions now stand, the Mississippi offers a 14-foot depth below St. Louis, to equal the 14 feet now urged for the Illinois, for from five to seven months in the average year. An assured minimum of 9 to 10 feet is promised. The method by which a 20-foot depth in the lower Mississippi can be secured is not yet clear, though there is no reason to doubt its ultimate possibility.

Summarizing the facts thus far brought out, but leaving for the next section the discussion of the commercial importance of the deep waterway project, your memorialists respectfully urge upon your consideration the following points:

1. The construction of the proposed waterway is thoroughly practicable.
2. It does not involve the cutting of a new channel through rock, but is really the deepening and improving of an existing waterway, and so is consistent with the known policy of Congress.
3. The Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal stands completed and ready for use as the eastern section of such a waterway.
4. The total cost of developing and making available a channel which in connection with the Sanitary and Ship Canal will furnish a waterway of 22 feet depth for the first 42 miles, and of 14 feet depth for the rest of the way, will not exceed \$22,000,000 to the mouth of the Illinois or \$27,000,000 to St. Louis, the larger figure being little more than half of what the sanitary district of Chicago will alone have spent when its entire work is finished.
5. Besides serving the purposes of navigation, the proposed channel would provide for the flood waters of the Desplaines and Illinois rivers, and thus prevent the serious injury now done almost yearly to the dwellers along the river valleys.
6. The State of Illinois has by legislation and by joint resolution of its general assembly not only formally given approval to the project, but contingently turned the channel over to the Federal Government for navigation purposes, the Government control to begin as soon as the full length of the waterway is open.
7. The 14-foot minimum depth is suggested as desirable, but without prejudice against any other depths which may prove after fuller surveys to be better.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of listening in the last few months to very excellent addresses on the part of several Members of this House on the general subject of immigration; and I desire to speak briefly concerning the first four or five lines of the Dillingham bill, recently reported in the Senate, which, as to those particular lines, is practically the same as the bill this day ordered to be reported from the Committee on Immigration of the House.

As I followed the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON], I gathered that these gentlemen were what might be termed "selectionists;" that is, in favor of immigration of a proper sort and opposed to all immigration of an improper sort. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] I would perhaps class as a "restrictionist," differing somewhat from the other three in his general ideas on the subject. Therefore, in what I have to say I will perhaps touch more directly upon the remarks of the three gentlemen who are "selectionists," than those of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], a "restrictionist." The provision to which I refer in the Dillingham bill is as follows:

SECTION 1. That there shall be levied and collected and paid a duty of \$5 for each and every passenger, not a citizen of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada, not a citizen of the Republic of Cuba, or the Republic of Mexico, who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to any port within the United States, or by railway or other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States.

That is what is known as the "head tax" provision. The tax is paid by the steamship companies, and the two committees, that of the Senate and that of the House, are endeavoring to raise that head tax from \$2, the sum at which it is now fixed, to \$5.

Now, the aim of the "selectionists," as I understand it, is to get better immigrants. Some of them stated very frankly that they were opposed to immigrants from Italy and southeastern Europe; others said that their remarks apply to no particular race, but all said that they had no particular objection to number if the quality of the immigrant was all right.

Now, let us see how the \$5 head tax will work out. I do not know whether it is generally understood that a \$5 head tax means \$5 on every man, woman, and child; that it is just the same on the nursing baby as it is on the sturdy workman; that there is no gradation, change, or difference. So here is what happens. My friends say they want to keep out the man who comes here just for a few months to earn money and then go back to some other country. A \$5 head tax does not affect him at all. It simply means that he has to make arrangements not only to get the money to pay his fare across the ocean, but to pay the additional \$3 which will be deducted from his first week's or month's money. You have not even caused him inconvenience. He has only himself to look out for. The difference in wages between the country from which he comes and the wages here make this up so quickly that the amount is absolutely inconsiderable so far as he is concerned, and you have not kept one of these men out. On the other hand, take what these gentlemen call the desirable classes of immigrants, the men from the northern part of Europe, for whom I have just as high respect as they, although I differ with them in their attempt to classify immigration as desirable or undesirable by countries. Take the men who come from there with families. Take the man who comes with his wife and five or six children, as these Germans, Irishmen, Finns, Swedes, Danes, and Norwegians do, day after day, into the ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and the other ports. Instead of meaning \$5 to every one of those men it means \$5 multiplied by as many as there are in his family, down to the youngest child; and instead of restricting the coming of the man who means to stay but a few months to make a little money and go back, and the single man, you have penalized the man who intends coming here with his family to make this his permanent home and abiding place. So much for that branch of it.

If there ever was a bill that should have been labeled a gift to foreign steamship companies, this is that bill. Who pays this head tax? The law says that it is a lien on the steamship, and the steamship company pays it. How does it pay it? Why, of course, in the end the money does not come out of the funds of the steamship company, but it is put on the ticket. Obviously, there can be but one price for tickets, and to-day there is but one price. So what is the result? Does the alien immigrant alone pay this head tax? Oh, no; everybody who comes across the Atlantic Ocean, first or second class or steerage, pays it to-day; either the full \$2 or some portion of it; and where the

Government does not get the \$2—that is, where the money is paid by an American citizen returning or an alien who already has a domicile here, or anyone, except those to whom the law applies—the steamship company gets the \$2, and we are legislating to raise the rate of dividend of the German and all the other foreign steamship lines, for we have only one American line of shipping on the Atlantic coast engaged in this business, that line running to Philadelphia and New York. So that is what we are going to do. There was not a steamship company came before our committee to protest, and I do not wonder. It had been advertised far and abroad that the head tax was going to be raised. That was a gift for the steamship companies to the extent of \$3 on every ticket sold to other than aliens. That is all that that particular part of this much-advertised bill does. It stops nobody except the man with a wife and family.

The steamship companies! It gives them all there is in the bill. American citizens returning from abroad! It makes them pay either the full \$5, or so much as the steamship companies determine that the traffic will stand of the \$5, in addition to what they would otherwise pay for passage; and, above all, and more than that, this bill takes from the immigrating family \$5 for every man, woman, and child of the immigrants that the gentlemen to whom I have alluded most earnestly desire. What will they do? They will do what they are doing now to some extent, only more so. Instead of taking a steamer for an American port and becoming valuable American citizens, with American opportunities for themselves and their children, they will take a British steamer to Canada or some other foreign steamer to Argentina, and we shall lose just the kind of immigrants who in the early days went out on the western prairies and everywhere and built up all of the great Middle West. Canada, that is to-day sending agents down into Minnesota and Wisconsin and paying them a premium for every American citizen that they can get to emigrate across the border over into their wheat fields, will get the kind of immigrants that these gentlemen say that they want to get here.

I intend, as to that particular provision of the bill, should it come before the House, to vote against it. I think the sober second thought of the Members here, when they study the question, will lead them along the same lines, and I believe that when that question is thoroughly considered they will come to the conclusion that the head tax is all right for this purpose—and this purpose only—to pay the expenses of the immigration service. What are the facts to-day? This \$2 head tax has been in force just three years, and to-day they have paid all the expenses of immigration out of the fund raised from that \$2 head tax and have a fund of over \$2,000,000 as a surplus; and when I say "expenses" I include additional land and new buildings. The gentlemen who drafted the House bill were so certain that it would be a revenue-producing measure, that it would produce more money than would be necessary for the needs of the service, as to insert the provision that where the head tax produces more than two and one-half million dollars yearly the surplus shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

In other words, if this bill succeeds, we are going into the business of taxing not only the immigrant, which is bad enough, but taxing the casual visitor, for this bill applies to every alien passenger that crosses either the Atlantic or Pacific ocean, and making each of our own citizens pay \$5 to some foreign steamship company. Every German that comes to investigate our great resources, every Englishman who travels in the great West is subject to this tax. Up to last year there had more Englishmen gone each year through the Yellowstone Park than there had Americans. He pays, in addition to the expenses of travel, an utterly unnecessary sum of \$5. Up to this time the head tax has not been a large sum, and it has not been noticed, but the increase will be noticed and travel will be diverted. It is these annoying little things at the threshold that do divert travel.

To sum up, we do not stop a single undesirable man by the increase. We make the poor man, who has had to struggle to get here, who has money enough to start him in, go down into his slender resources and pay the Government—that does not need it—anywhere from \$10 to \$60 for the privilege of crossing our shore line. We accomplish nothing by it, and I hope when the bill comes before the House this head tax will be put back where it is now, where it is justified, where it simply raises money enough to cover the expense and causes no one any serious inconvenience. [Applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. I suggest now that the gentleman from Tennessee occupy the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, considering its record, one must view with misgiving confidence the conduct of the party in power, as represented on this floor, in having supported the measure to save the people from the extortions, discriminations, and rebates by the railroads. If sincere in its protestation for public good, why has it not made an effort to rid the country of that more grievous evil—the unbridled and unconscionable trusts? Nor will the American people confide in the fidelity of the President in supporting this great Democratic policy unless he intensifies his efforts to save them from these far more destructive evils. His abortive court procedure invokes derisive contempt from both the people and the trusts, and this mockery is being accepted by many as either an approval of or a surrender to these monsters of iniquity by the party in power.

The Administration must know that the trusts are barricaded by protection; it must further know the most serious blow that could be inflicted is to repeal the protective schedules of the Dingley law. They laugh at the futile attempts to enforce the antitrust laws, but if the trust-controlled articles were put upon the free list there would be "wailing and gnashing of teeth" in their camp. It is within the power of this Congress to destroy 85 per cent of the trusts within the next twenty days, and it is "up to" our Republican friends to act now or stand branded as the champions of the most villainous iniquity of the age. The President in his early manhood drank too deeply of the political philosophy of Cobden and Bright not to be fully advised that the trusts are the fruits of protection, and his acute strenuousness in investigating public wrongs must have long since convinced him that the existing railroad abuses are largely the parasitic evils of protection and trusts—that in the clutches of such giants as the steel, beef, and oil trusts the greatest railroads are as powerless as a private citizen, and that when they say "Come," they cometh, "Go," they goeth, or are either absorbed or subjected to a ruinous boycott. Knowing these facts and remembering that he has acquired a reputation for proverbial honesty of statesmanship, we can not account for his complete surrender to the tariff "stand-pat" policy of his party, unless it be that his quietude is inspired by the disloyalty of his party friends; too, he doubtless remembers that it took Moses many years to overcome the idolatry of the Israelites.

Mr. Chairman, I am an avowed advocate of railroad rate legislation, believing that rebates and private car lines are auxiliaries to the trusts. I voted for the Hepburn bill, and, though defective as it is, I believe its adoption will likely result in much good to the country. But to one who thinks a moment about the industrial conditions of the country, how insignificant must appear the "graft" of railroads when contrasted with the wholesale robberies of the trusts. While the railroads have increased the price of freight on lumber about 17 per cent, the lumber trust has increased the cost of the product to the home builder more than 100 per cent. While the railroads have increased the freight on shoes about one-fourth of a cent per pair from Boston to the South, the hide trust, an adjunct of the beef trust, has increased the price from 10 to 50 cents per pair within the last six months. Governor Douglas, of Massachusetts, is credited with recently saying that the duty on hides alone annually cost the people \$10,000,000, of which \$2,250,000 is paid to the Government and the balance of more than \$7,000,000 to the hide trust. The railroads have unjustly increased the freight on agricultural implements from Chicago to the great Southwest, but the international harvester trust sell the same products to the foreign farmer for from 20 to 30 per cent less than to those at home. Since the Dingley law went into operation the railroads have doubtless largely increased the freight on iron, steel, and the manufactures thereof, but the steel trust has almost doubled the price of these products. A manufacturer of farm wagons, in explaining why he advanced prices 25 per cent, said:

Less than two years ago the president of the great steel corporation testified that bar iron and steel could be produced at a profit for \$12.50 per ton, and for steel we must pay \$40, or over 200 per cent profit. The steel magnates tell us that when iron was sold at \$18 per ton the price was too low and was a breeder of panics; but we all recall the fact that in 1893 the Carnegie properties were valued at less than \$10,000,000, and that after five years of panic and \$18 prices Mr. Carnegie sold his interests alone in these properties for \$360,000,000. This was 350 per cent profit in five years, or 72 per cent annually, and in panic times, too. How long, O Lord, how long, will "the dear people" be thus fooled?

And, too, how insignificant appear the rebates on the freight on sugar when compared with the millions annually pocketed by the sugar trust; and as another evidence of the insincerity of our Republican friends, let me state that the Democrats on two different occasions within the last two years have voted almost solidly to repeal the duty on refined sugar and thereby destroy the sugar trust, while our Republican friends voted almost solidly against the proposition. But more than this, there are a cartload of bills before the Ways and Means Committee touch-



ing every phase of the tariff law, all having for their chief aim the abolition of a trust, as well as the opening of new markets for our increasing commerce, and if passed would save millions to the consumers on agricultural implements, barbed wire, shoes, vehicles, and other necessities. But they are as dead in that committee as though interred in the Arlington Cemetery. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, what better evidence of the duplicity and arrant hypocrisy of the Republican party is wanted? It may be that their policy of crucifying the witch and sparing the devil is founded upon the lurking prejudice against the railroads for failing to "come across" as liberally as they should have done in the late Presidential campaign. Perhaps if the latter had contributed as liberally as did the trusts and the insurance companies, these Ababs of protection might have spared their vineyards, and at this good hour their lords might have been wining and dining with the McCurdys in the courts abroad. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Our Republican friends should not conclude for a moment that by their cuttlefish antics in dealing with existing wrongs they can muddy the waters of public opinion. The people are beginning to know the real issue, the real cause of the trouble, and appreciate the insincerity of any effort to abolish the trusts without the abolition of protection. It is known in every hamlet that the steel trust, sugar trust, agricultural-implement trust, and many others are waxing strong and stronger, day by day, under the sheltering schedules of the Dingley law.

The question of the hour is, Who shall live—the people or the trusts? Who shall sway the rod of empire—the people or these monsters of protection? Whether the great agricultural industry of the South and West shall be released from these bandits of spoliation and have a free and unfettered market for their increasing crops and whether the multitude of American consumers shall continue to pay more tribute to the moguls of protection than to the support of their Government are the real issues.

The people are determined in their efforts for reform, and our Republican friends can not quell them by such pacific measures as this emasculated Hepburn bill or by sending a few petty thieves from the Post-Office Department to the penitentiary. The wage-earners want a chance to enjoy the fruits of their toil. The masses are crying for an opportunity to spend their hard earnings in the support and education of their families instead of dividing it with bandits. The 30,000,000 of our farmers, who scorn a bounty from the Government, demand the world for their market. Their broad acres are smiling with riches as soon as the Government stays the hand of the robber and removes the protective wall that isolates them from the world.

Mr. Chairman, I dare say that if the great consuming masses of the country could fully appreciate the extent of the wholesale robbery being daily perpetrated under the laws of their country, if they could know and behold the truth of the iniquities that follow in the wake of protection, there would be a political revolution the like of which has not found a place in history.

The great mass of our plain, patriotic people, having labored incessantly for a living, have never considered seriously the proposition that under trust rule every cent of duty levied under the Dingley law on any article is paid by them, whether the same is imported or made at home. Thus, if the American farmers annually purchase 1,000,000 sewing machines, of which 1,000 are imported and 999,000 made at home, then the price of the 1,000, plus the tax of from \$5 to \$10 each, fixes the price of the entire number manufactured at home. The tariff tax is always added to the cost of the domestic product as well as to the cost of the imported article. If it is not added to the domestic as well as the imported article, there would be no use for protection. Its sole purpose is to enable the home manufacturer to add the amount of the tariff as an extra profit to the cost of production. Otherwise no one would want protection, or a low duty would do as well as a high one. In other words, when a manufacturer demands that there shall be a duty of 45 or 50 per cent tax on the article he makes, then he is simply asking the Government to permit him to add the said amount to the cost of production, since the difference in the expense of manufacturing here and elsewhere is more than equaled by the cost of transportation from a foreign country. This seems so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, may see it.

Speaking of the effect of protection, Alexander Hamilton said:

Duties of this nature evidently amount to a virtual bounty on the domestic fabrics.

To the same effect John Quincy Adams wrote:

The duty constitutes a part of the price of the whole mass of the article in the market. It is substantially paid upon the article of domestic manufacture as well as upon that of foreign production. Upon one it is a bounty, upon the other a burden, and the repeal of the tax

must operate as an equivalent reduction of the price of the article, whether foreign or domestic.

If the duty was regarded by the ablest friends of protection as a bounty to the manufacturer, and paid by the consumer, when there were no trusts, how should it now be considered when every vestige of domestic competition is destroyed?

Mr. Chairman, I contend that, separated by thousands of miles from all formidable competition and having more convenient raw material than any other nation, we can compete with any country in the manufacture of almost any article. I contend, further, that the entire tariff tax, amounting to not less than an average of 48 per cent on all kinds of manufactures, is a subsidy to the manufacturers, if taken; and I contend, further, that under the trust rule it is accepted and passed as a surplus profit into the coffers of the trusts. In these contentions I believe that I am sustained by the intelligent judgment of the American people, if not by the Republican wizards of this House.

In this connection let me read you a table showing the total amount of four leading products imported into the United States in 1905, together with the actual per cent rate of duty paid and amount received by the Government:

Articles.	Value.	Duty.	Ad valorem rate.
Iron and steel products.....	\$22,044,937	\$8,422,237	Per ct. 38
Meat products.....	726,064	254,332	35
Agricultural implements.....	13,876	2,775	20
Glass and glassware.....	5,776,669	3,311,715	57

The value of these imports plus the cost of transportation and plus the duty collected not only fixed their prices in this market, but also the prices of all like domestic products consumed. There is no difference in market price of an imported and non-imported article of like class. "A dress suit that cost \$22 in Berlin, plus a \$19 import duty, could not be duplicated out of domestic goods of like kind in this city for less than \$40," says a substantial citizen. Schwab, while at the head of the steel trust, wrote his man Frick a few years ago that, while steel rails sold here for \$28 a ton, he could deliver them in England for \$16 and make \$4 profit. It is a well-known fact that the beef trust sells meat 25 per cent higher in Buffalo than just across the line in Canada. The net profits of American steel industry alone for 1905 amounted to \$119,850,282. The Canadian tariff commission says:

Makers of thrashing machines, feeders, stackers, weighers, baggers, and portable farm engines in the United States are selling these things in Canada at 35 per cent below American prices. They say that the discounts are that much below what any jobber can obtain them for in the United States, and that a trade has been built up which amounts to \$750,000 a year.

These facts not only verify the doctrine of Hamilton and Adams, but demonstrate to every impartial mind that the entire duty is taxed against the consumer, that on the imported article going to the Government and on the domestic article to the trusts, which are born of protection and sired by the Republican party.

Thus there are 6,000,000 farms in the United States, and granting that each consumes 200 pounds of domestic wire, valued at 4 cents per pound, we find they consume 1,200,000,000 pounds, costing \$48,000,000; and applying the principle just enunciated we find that 42 per cent of the \$48,000,000, or \$20,000,000, is tariff profit to the trusts. The truth of this is apparent.

Let us apply this doctrine to a few of the general schedules of the Dingley law and note the results. By adding 15 per cent increase to the amount shown by the census report for 1900, we find that in 1905 the total iron and steel products manufactured in the United States amounted to \$1,131,395,205, of which \$134,727,221 was exported, leaving for home consumption the amount of \$996,667,984. Of this amount 38 per cent, or approximately \$378,000,000, was tax levied for the trust, while the Government on like products imported for the same year received only \$8,472,237, as is shown by the table just read.

In the same year and in the same manner we find that our total manufactured meat products amounted to \$1,000,000,000, being \$745,567,433 in 1900, of which was exported the amount of \$169,999,685, leaving \$830,000,315 for home consumption. Of this amount 35 per cent, or quite \$290,000,000, was tariff bounty to the meat trust, while the Government, as per the table read, received a tax on the imported product of only \$254,332. The average duty of 35 per cent is a modest estimate, since the tax is 2 cents a pound on fresh meats, 5 cents on hams and bacon, and 35 per cent on extracts of meat.

Likewise in 1905 we manufactured agricultural implements to the amount of \$126,000,000, of which we exported \$29,721,741, leaving \$96,278,259 for the home market. Of this 20 per cent,

or about \$19,000,000, was tariff to the trust, while the Government on like imported articles received only \$2,775, the amount imported being \$13,876.

It is estimated that in 1905 we produced about \$175,000,000 of glass and glassware and exported \$2,252,709, leaving for the domestic market \$192,747,291, of which 57 per cent, or more than \$86,000,000, is tax profit pure and simple.

In the same manner, on scores of other articles of everyday consumption, such as sugar, leather products, woolen goods, hats, cutlery, sewing machines, etc., it can be shown that, under the Dingley trust reign, the consumers are paying many times more to the trusts than to the Government. Collecting the facts I have just stated, we find that in 1905 the American consumers on four leading articles of everyday consumption were taxed by the Dingley law \$773,000,000 for the trusts, while only \$14,506,013 for their Government, as is shown by this table:

Articles.	To the Government.	To the trusts.
Iron and steel products .....	\$8,472,237	\$378,000,000
Meat products .....	254,532	290,000,000
Agricultural implements .....	2,775	19,000,000
Glass and glassware .....	5,776,669	86,000,000
Total .....	14,506,013	773,000,000

Mr. Chairman, this is a remarkable disclosure indeed, but it is nevertheless true. These estimates are based upon the rate of duty collected on the class of articles imported, while there are many articles in the schedules bearing a much higher duty that are not imported. If anyone doubts the truth of these figures let him go in the markets and buy a beefsteak, a window sash, a mowing machine, a roll of steel wire, and then have the same order duplicated in any free market. I dare say that there are 80,000,000 of American consumers who are willing to attest the truth of this proposition.

Let us present this robbery in another phase. A purchaser going into the markets to buy a bill of goods, places at least one-third of his money to the credit of the trusts. The farmer buying a bill of necessities in the home market pays the trusts the same tax he would have to pay the Government were he to buy them in England and bring them to this country. We submit the following, showing the approximate amount of "graft" for the trust on a modest bill of domestic merchandise, estimating the same according to the actual amount of tax paid on like products imported in 1905:

Articles.	Total cost.	Trust tax.
Sewing machine .....	\$25.00	\$7.00
Disk harrow .....	40.00	11.00
Vehicle .....	50.00	8.33
Set of harness .....	30.00	8.25
Worsteds suit .....	20.00	9.46
Glass, door, and window panels .....	50.00	31.80
8 barrels sugar .....	15.00	4.62
Total .....	230.00	80.47

The same bill of goods, made at the same time, out of the same material and in the same factories, is sold to foreigners at \$80.57 less than at home, and still the farmer votes the Republican ticket. I never think of protection and the farmer that I am not reminded of Macklin's definition of law, when he said: "It is a sort of hocus-pocus science, that smiles in yer face while it picks yer pockets."

But, sir, there is one pertinent inquiry in this connection that I desire to make. How can your party face the farmers of the West in defense of a policy that taxes them \$19,000,000 for the trusts while only \$2,775 for their Government? Or, how are you to stand before the 80,000,000 of our meat consumers, who are being annually robbed under your coveted policy of \$290,000,000? If they knew, as we know, your party would be crying for the mountains to fall upon it to hide its iniquity.

A few days ago I introduced a bill to place all kinds of manufactured meat products on the free list, and if this Congress will pass it, not only will the beef trust be destroyed, but millions will be blessed. Canada has a meat surplus of \$31,000,000; Argentina, \$27,000,000; New Zealand, \$19,000,000, and Australia \$11,000,000, as well as other countries many millions, all ready to come into our market and destroy the trust, if you will but pass this bill. Now, what are you going to do—stand by the people or the trust?

Charles Edward Russell, in his valuable work on the beef trust, says it annually extracts from the railroads \$25,000,000 in rebates. The rate bill is intended to stop this iniquity.

Now, by passing this bill and cutting off the multiplied millions of tariff "graft," this monster of criminal aggression will be shorn of its gory locks. In the brief period of ten days you can accomplish more good than can the courts in a century. Adopt this measure and not only will the trust be destroyed, but millions of the poor who have not tasted this life-giving food for months will waft your praises to heaven.

Mr. Chairman, in view of these appalling abuses of protection we should send a message of warning to the American people. It should be proclaimed in every hamlet that the time has arrived in the life of this Republic when under the law a private citizen is taxed many times more to enrich the trusts than to support his Government. Every toiling farmer should be impressed with the truth of the statement that his class is taxed annually a hundred times more for the trusts than for the Government on the implements of husbandry; and the whole people should know that their annual tribute to the beef trust alone is nearly equal to the total expenditures of the Government. Impart these facts as we know them, and I dare say there will be a political panic in November.

Mr. GREENE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREENE. What is the state of industry in Mississippi to-day, prosperous or not?

Mr. BYRD. Everything is prosperous, but nothing depending on protection.

Mr. GREENE. Are they very prosperous?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. GREENE. What was the state of industry under the Wilson bill?

Mr. BYRD. My brother, if you will sit in that chair and listen until I get through I will tell you.

Mr. GREENE. Will not the gentleman answer what was the state of industry during the life of the Wilson bill?

Mr. BYRD. Well, not as bad as in 1873, when the Republicans had control.

Mr. GREENE. Never mind that; I ask you what was the state of industry under the Wilson bill?

Mr. BYRD. About as good as at any other time back to 1860, when the Republican reign began.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BYRD. Only a question.

Mr. POU. I would like to inquire if the paralyzed conditions did not exist in foreign countries at that time as well as in the United States?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; that is all in my speech, and I do not want to anticipate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to suggest in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] that the price of cotton in Mississippi was lower under the first McKinley Administration than it has ever been in the history of the country.

Mr. BYRD. Protection is binding the Government and the trusts in enduring wedlock, and the Republican party is the high priest officiating at the nuptial debauchery. This unhallowed union reminds one of that ancient Jew, of reasonable respectability, who united his destiny with the princess of devils—Jezabel. But these unholy bonds must be dissolved; the time for separation is at hand; the unforgiving sin has been committed. Appeals to the courts will not suffice; such punishment is regarded by the trusts as the boy considers the brief, stinging "flogging" of his affectionate father. If the party in power really desires their destruction, if it really craves consternation in their ranks, immediately sever their life-giving artery—protection. [Applause.]

I am aware that the power of taxation for legitimate purposes is inherent in all governments, that revenue is the lifeblood of organized society, and that often in the administration of this high function of government grievous wrongs have been committed in all ages and in all countries. But surely not elsewhere in the realms of civilization can be found a parallel for such prostitution of the taxing power as under the Dingley law. Other nations impose duties, but not for the sole purpose of fostering criminals. By a system of impressment the Sultan of Turkey may appropriate the entire estate of his subject even to support his lusty harem, but the priest-ridden heathen is taught that his sacrifice is for the public good. Ours is a system of legalized impressment by which private property is subjected, not for public weal but private greed. The lustful Oriental inflicts his wrong for public vice—ours is for private, and oft-times bacchanalian debauchery; and while the wrongs of the one may be forgotten in blissful ignorance, the tyrannies of the other will endure as long as the fire of just resentment burns in a patriotic heart. [Applause.]

Sir, in answer to those who refer to free oil and the Standard Oil trust to disprove the contention that protection is the au-



thor of these evils, I want to say that that monster of finance is not more dependent on oil than on protected industries for its wonderful success. It has reached out and drawn into its hideous fold many of our most highly protected enterprises. The Evening Times a few days ago gave a long list of protected industries, representing hundreds of millions of dollars, controlled by the Standard Oil people. Nor do we admit that oil and petroleum are unprotected. It is true that they are on the free list, but with this proviso:

That if there be imported into the United States crude petroleum or the products of crude petroleum produced in any country which imposes a duty on petroleum or its products exported from the United States, there shall, in such cases, be levied, paid, and collected a duty upon said crude petroleum or its products so imported equal to the duty imposed by such country.

Russia, our only competitor in the export of oil, having protected her product by a heavy duty against all countries, is excluded from our markets by this act, and with the Russian products outlawed the trust has no opposition from any quarter. Indeed this is a very artful manner of providing for this baby industry by its friends. But "the ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib." [Applause.]

A trust lives only when competition dies, and it is not a trust until all competitors are destroyed or controlled. Anything that limits the number or domain of independent industries facilitates trust formation, and if it is difficult to destroy competition in a county it is more so in a State, still more so in the nation, and infinitely more so in the world. This being true, and protection having destroyed foreign competition, it follows as a logical sequence that this is an inviting field to be exploited by those strong enough to overcome domestic competition. The princely bounties offered intensify industrial effort to such an extent that our manufacturers, like ravenous wolves over the carcass of the plains, contest with each other for the lion's share of the booty, destroying the weak to satisfy gourmandized greed. If this alluring bequest is not the real trouble, why should this be such a coveted home for the trusts? Why do they not abound in Mexico and Canada? Or why did they not infest this country in the days when this bounty was not so inviting? The unlawful centralization of capital has intensified in the same ratio that tariff profits have increased, and the trusts will be destroyed to the same extent that these emoluments are diminished. It may be true that a few might survive the wreck of tariff reformation, but they would be emasculated of all danger; would be like the hideous, writhing serpent with its poisonous fangs extracted—might strike, but do no harm. In that event the consumers would have the open markets of the world as a protecting shield from the criminal extortions at home.

Mr. Chairman, having at the last session submitted a few remarks touching the effect of protection on our foreign markets, I will not again discuss it more than to say that in retaliation of our trust-breeding policy Canada, China, England, and Germany are rapidly boycotting our products. Canada is passing her antidumping laws, and our outlawed goods are rotting in the warehouses of China. England is largely buying her great food supply from Argentina, Canada, Denmark, the Netherlands, and elsewhere, and Germany has grown so vindictive in her retaliating war policy as to necessitate the intervention of our State Department to hold her in abeyance for even twelve months. Under her new tariff American meat products are completely excluded from that market. I wonder what the meat producers of the West will think of protection and the trusts when they learn that this rich market, which in 1905 consumed \$72,000,000 of their products, will soon be closed to them, and when they learn from a bulletin just published by the Agricultural Department that their product is being rapidly driven from Great Britain, the greatest meat market of the world; that there has been no increase in the importation into that country from the United States since 1895, while from Canada and Denmark it has doubled, and from Argentina it has increased fourfold. In the item of fresh beef alone England's annual imports from the United States in the same time have declined from 75 to 55 per cent, and from Argentina have increased from 2 to 36 per cent. Destroy protection and the trusts and you will end the Chamberlain crusade against American products in that rich market.

Some months ago the New York Chamber of Commerce sent out a circular letter warning the country of the dangers threatening our foreign trade, from which I read the following:

It is of the utmost importance that the National Government be informed in no uncertain terms of the demand of the business community that our foreign trade be extended and enlarged by improved commercial relations with the countries of Europe, so that the imminent danger of a disastrous tariff war of retaliation may be avoided, and we would therefore urge you to present your views on this subject to the President of the United States and his advisers, and also to the Senators and Congressmen from your State. It is necessary that

this important question, which means either life and growth or practical extinction to a large part of our valuable export trade, should be thoroughly agitated. To this end the prompt, thorough, and effective support of all the commercial organizations of the country is imperatively demanded.

Again, permit me to say that the future of the South is vitally interested in the revocation of this market-destroying policy. She is absolutely dependent on foreign consumption of her great staple product. Anything limiting the extent of her market is destructive to her prosperity. In 1895 foreign countries took our cotton, 4,870,451 bales, at 5 cents per pound, and in 1905 they took about 8,000,000 bales, at from 8 to 12 cents per pound. Our sales of raw cotton to Japan and China from 1901 to 1905 have increased from 86,243 to 332,243 bales.

In 1895 our total exports of cotton cloths amounted to 694,500,715 yards, of which 474,909,500 yards went to China alone. She paid for this product \$27,761,095, while in 1903 she took only 277,671,500 yards, valued at \$13,685,860, having more than doubled in three years. These figures are remarkable indeed when we consider for a moment that little more than a decade ago our cotton products were not noted in the statistics from that country. At this ratio of increase China alone will, in less than ten years, consume one-third of our cotton products. She is the greatest prospective cotton market of the world, being more densely populated and just emerging from a state of semi-barbarism, she has wonderful trade advantages for those who are judicious enough to embrace them. It is our candid opinion that an unfettered market with that country will enrich not only the South, but the cotton factory districts of New England; and, in view of this fact, it is strange indeed how anyone living in that section can affiliate with a party whose policy tends to isolate them from the richest market of the world.

But can we have any assurance of these promised riches from China with her 400,000,000 people? Have we not by our misguided legislation invoked a ruinous boycott to American commerce, if not civil war with that country? Instead of marshaling our armies upon the shores of China, why not modify our tariff schedule and repeal the discriminating features of the Chinese exclusion law, or why not apply its provisions to like characters from other countries, thereby removing its offending features, and save the South its greatest market, as well as the nation from threatened war? Instead of spending this session on minor measures, why not do something that will make half of New England and all of the South sing our praises? To the South peace with China means wealth; war means ruin.

But, just in this connection, I want to say that all praise is due the President for recently sending special trade agents to South America, China, and elsewhere. The reports of two of these, Messrs. Crist and Burrell, just issued by the Bureau of Commerce and Labor, is a revelation on the possibilities of our trade with China, and should be read by every citizen.

Permit me to read from them a few brief excerpts touching the cotton possibilities in China:

American manufactures, especially of cotton goods, have a wonderful opportunity in China. The territory for exploiting is practically a limitless one. \* \* \* With the establishment here of more Americans in the foreign trade the use of various cotton goods should increase greatly and all competition should be overcome. \* \* \* Out of a total value of cotton piece goods sold in this (Tientsin) market during 1904 of over \$6,500,000, these lines represent the great bulk, and approximately two-thirds of the sum stated are supplied by Manchester mills from cotton obtained in America, shipped across the Atlantic Ocean, woven into cloth, and shipped to northern China. That a greatly increased share of this as well as of the entire Chinese market can be won by American manufacturers and held against all competitors there is not the slightest doubt. \* \* \* The offtake from the Shanghai market, where virtually the entire import is centered, has grown from a total in 1895 of 1,647,000 pieces of all descriptions of American goods to a total in 1904 of 8,200,000 pieces, in round numbers. It is estimated that this year fully 10,000,000 pieces of cotton goods have been imported, all indicating a most gratifying increase in the exportation of American piece goods to this market. \* \* \* The boycott caused a complete stagnation of business, and the enormous quantity of goods ordered for speculative purposes also affected the situation. Extensive orders had been placed in due time, shipments were made, and cargo after cargo of piece goods arrived in Shanghai, only to be consigned to the warehouses or godowns.

Mr. Chairman, this disastrous boycott of American goods by China is not the only result of the discriminating features of the Chinese-exclusion law, but is largely caused by the maladministration of that law. Hon. John W. Foster, once a Cabinet officer and the very best authority on the subject, recently said:

The Chinese boycott of American goods is a striking evidence of an awakening spirit of resentment in the great Empire against the injustice and aggression of foreign countries. \* \* \* The treatment which the Chinese residents have received at the hands of hoodlums, ruffians, race haters, and mobs has been a disgrace to our civilization; but that has not been so shameful as their treatment by the officials of Federal and local governments.

In describing a recent raid against the Chinese by Federal officers in Boston, he says:

Every Chinese who did not at once produce his certificate of residence was taken in charge, and the unfortunate ones were rushed off

to the Federal building without further ceremony. \* \* \* In the raid no mercy was shown by the Government officials. The frightened Chinese who had sought to escape were dragged from their hiding places and stowed like cattle upon wagons or other vehicles to be conveyed to the designated place of detention. On one of those wagons or trucks from seventy to eighty persons were thrown, and soon after it moved it was overturned. A scene of indescribable confusion followed, in which the shrieks of those attempting to escape mingled with the groans of those who were injured.

But leaving this part of my subject let me say that the average duty on all protected articles under the Dingley law is about 48 per cent, and since at least 80 per cent of our manufactured products are controlled by the trust for the sole purpose of appropriating all the tariff bounty, that counting only 20 per cent of the value of our entire manufactured products as tariff tax, we have an alarming result. In 1900 our total manufactured products amounted to \$8,370,000,000, and for 1905 it is estimated at not less than \$9,000,000,000. Of this amount we exported \$548,607,975, leaving a balance of \$8,456,392,025 for home consumption, on which the American consumer paid a tax at this conservative rate of about \$1,691,278,405 to the trust, while in the same year they paid less than one-half of this amount to support the Government. But some will contend that this amount is not added. If not, why not? The real truth is, more is added, when we consider that there are more than a hundred articles controlled by the trust on which the tax is more than 100 per cent.

In this connection there is another thought worthy of consideration. If we will deduct the tariff value, together with the \$2,000,000,000 of raw farm products that enter into manufactures, we will find that the net value of the entire factory products is \$5,308,721,595, while that of the farm is \$6,415,000,000. In the fiscal year 1905 the exports from the American farm amounted to \$820,863,405, and from the factory \$543,607,975. These figures show conclusively that the farm is our greatest wealth-producing industry, yet it is a remarkable fact that rural wealth has not increased in the same proportion as that of the factory centers, the cities, as will appear from the following table, from 1860 to 1900:

Year.	Urban.	Rural.
1860	\$8,180,000,000	\$7,980,000,000
1880	31,538,000,000	12,104,000,000
1900	73,786,000,000	20,514,000,000

What a remarkable difference would have been in this table if the one had not been subsidized with a bounty of from one-half to one billion dollars annually almost exclusively at the expense of the other. Protection is the cause of the disparity of these figures. Upon what principle of economic philosophy can such a policy be predicated; or where can a logical reason be found for destroying the market for a greater industry in order that a smaller one may thrive on monopoly? Or, in this Union of equal States, how can you justify pauperizing one to enrich another? Such a policy is abhorrent to every principle of political economy, and will ultimately destroy the Republic unless checked.

Mr. Chairman, our Republican friends scorn the idea of riding the country of this iniquity, their leader having announced a few days ago that there would be no tariff legislation in the Fifty-ninth Congress. By their inaction they acknowledge to the world that favoritism in the administration of Republican government is a virtue; that legalized robbery is a benediction; that sectionalism is the spirit of the Constitution, and that anarchy and agrarianism are "rather to be chosen" than Democracy and patriotism.

But it is contended that we must have protection for revenue; if not for this, for fostering American industries; if not for this, to protect our labor; if not for this, for building up home markets for our farmers; and if not for this, for the unacknowledged purpose of providing an inexhaustible resource from whence to draw campaign funds, and, however insidiously wrong it may appear, the latter is the more sensible purpose, since the others vanish in the sunlight of reason.

Revenue is paid on the imported article and not the domestic. High duties prevent importation and destroy revenue, while low duties encourage importation and increase revenue. In 1904, manufactures of wool imported, with a duty of 92 per cent, paid the Government \$16,000,000, while 1896, like imports, with a duty of 47 per cent, paid \$23,000,000. Hence, as the tax increases the revenue decreases.

It is the protective and not the revenue schedules of the tariff law against which the country so seriously complains. A revenue tariff is a duty levied for revenue with incidental protection to legitimate American industries, and a protection tariff is a duty levied for the benefit of the trust with incidental

emoluments to the Government. In other words, protection gives all or much more to the trusts than to the Government. When the tax is so high as to practically prevent the importation of the article taxed, then the trusts get the loaf and the Government the crumbs. Such are the schedules of the Dingley law, imposing more than a billion dollars annually on our consumers for the trust and manufacturers, while giving the Government less than one-half that amount. Hence it follows that duties levied for revenue only is the only honest system of tariff taxation.

Protection was never intended for more than a temporary aid to our struggling industries by the fathers of the policy. Senator Lodge, in his splendid biography of Alexander Hamilton, who was the founder as well as the ablest exponent of the doctrine, says Hamilton took "substantially the same ground as Mill in his Political Economy that protection for nascent industries in order to remove the obstacles of starting is wise and proper." And Hamilton himself justifies it to abate "the fear of want of success in untried enterprises, the intrinsic difficulties of first essays."

Hamilton, Clay, Webster, and Calhoun, the ablest in the litany of American statesmen, all advocated moderate protection when our infant industries were struggling in the wilds of a new country, and when England, the greatest manufacturing country in the world, with that malice born of unsuccessful war, was trying to destroy them. But what would they now say could they behold the present prostitution of their cherished policy, or what would be their consternation could they behold our "nascent industries" struggling for existence with the Herculean giants of Dingleyism—the trusts?

The doctrine of protecting infant industries from "the obstacles of starting" is as dead as its illustrious founder. As administered by the "latter-day saints" of the creed, it paralyzes legitimate industrial effort by fostered vandalism. It upbuilds irrepressible trusts to crush them. Bankruptcy and ruin is the reward of every business enterprise falling into their clutches. A poor man might as well sink his hard earnings in the "deep blue sea" as to embark in almost any business enterprise. Unless a "captain of finance" he is barred from the "pursuit of happiness" in many legitimate avocations. Consequently our capital is seeking investment abroad. Nearly six millions have gone to Mexico, two millions to Cuba and Canada each, and vast sums to South America and Hawaii—so says a high governmental official. There is being prepared in the Census Department a bulletin showing that the number of industrial enterprises are rapidly decreasing. All minor industries that are not absorbed are being destroyed to make clear the highway of plunder. Sir, the protection given "nascent industries" by the Dingley law is like that given by the hungry lion to the weaker denizens of the forest, or that the ravenous eagle gives the defenseless lamb it swoops down upon and bears away to the mountain crag for a dainty meal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That protection helps American labor is likewise untenable. If one-half heard from the other side about the "compensating wage" were true, every industrial artisan could rear his family in affluence rather than in poverty and vice, as is true in many industrial centers. The laborers for nonprotected industries own more homes and are more contented and happy than any other laboring class. If anyone doubts this let him consult the railroads, construction companies, building contractors, and the farm laborers of the South and the West. From the humble negro plowman to the skilled mechanic, their wages have in many sections increased from 50 to 100 per cent since 1900. The average yearly wages of railroad employees throughout the country in 1900 was \$595, while the steel industry, protected by millions of tariff "graft," paid only \$520, and the manufacturing wool and worsted industries of Massachusetts, which is also protected to the extent of millions of tariff profit, in 1903 only paid from \$422 to \$490 to laborers. Mr. Have-meyer before the Industrial Commission said the wages paid by the sugar trust was \$1.35 to \$1.50 per day of from eight to twelve hours, and the employees were required to work in a heat of from 90° to 110°. Deduct from this the daily cost of their food and lodging in a crowded city and how much will their wives and children receive? Poor, deluded creatures. To all such I would say: "Take up thy bed and walk" to the sunny South, where the Lord and justice reign. Remove your children from that dismal tenement of vice and crime to where there is no hunger and where sympathy rides the sunbeam and charity blooms with the wild flower, and where they can grow up to vigorous manhood and virtuous womanhood.

In further refutation of this fallacious contention, permit me to say that the strikes—the torch—the rifle—yea, incipient anarchy, have been quite as available as Dingleyism in raising



wages. The coal miners have inaugurated the most stupendous strike of the age. Why do they strike? Why do they not look to protection for satisfactory wages? It gives the operators a bounty of 60 cents a ton on coal, which, according to good authority, pays quite all the expense of mining. In other words, the Government goes down into the bowels of the earth and brings forth the product practically as a free offering to the operator, and why do they not divide this bounty with the miners and save the bloodshed and misery of a strike?

From a report of the Census Bureau, showing the increase of wages per hour, from 1890 to 1903, we find that wages in four protected industries have increased less than in nonprotected industries.

PROTECTED.		Per cent.
Boiler makers	-----	0.02
Iron molders	-----	.04
Machinists	-----	.04
Blacksmiths	-----	.02
NONPROTECTED.		
Bricklayers	-----	.11
Hod carriers	-----	.06
Painters	-----	.07
Carpenters	-----	.08

There may be some truth in the statement that the wages of industrial laborers have advanced 20 or 25 per cent since the enactment of the Dingley law, but what does this profit the wage-earner, since it costs 40 per cent more to live than in 1897? The average American laborer does not work for stocks, bonds, or gold, but for food and raiment for wife and children. Hence his dollar-a-day wage in 1897 was more than his \$1.25 of to-day. Then he purchased beef at 10 cents a pound, now he pays the trusts 18 cents; his shoes at 90 cents, now at \$1.35; his worsted suit at \$7, now \$10; his hat at \$1, now \$1.35; his sewing machine at \$12, now \$20; and so on through the schedule of the necessities. If a laborer spends all of his wages for necessities, advanced in price 40 per cent, while his earnings have only increased 25 per cent, then according to the rules of common sense he is being surely impoverished. What good doth it do a man to pay him a dollar and the next breath rob him of it?

But there is another fact that belies this pretended panacea for the laborer. The Commissioner of Labor, in his 1903 report, shows that the less number of people owned their homes in the highly protected sections than elsewhere in the Union. Listen to the following, showing the per cent that own homes and the per cent that live in rented homes, to wit:

Section.	Rented homes.	Owned homes.
	Per ct.	Per ct.
North Atlantic States	86.66	13.34
South Atlantic States	80.44	19.56
North Central States	72.44	27.56
South Central States	79.20	20.80
Western States	69.03	30.97

These figures tell the story of the laborer's degradation and the fallacy of protection for his benefit with more eloquence than human lips can utter. After the highest system of protection known to the world for forty years, we find more homeless people in the protected North Atlantic States than in the practically nonprotected Southern States; and, too, it must not be overlooked that the civil war left that section almost as bare as Sahara and with millions of pauperized negroes to care for. What has gone with the multiplied millions from protection that like manna from heaven has annually fallen on that section? Why should anyone dare cringe from shivering winds or the pangs of hunger? If you will give the South one-half that bounty, no one will ever again say in all that section that he "hath not where to lay his head." But the per capita of wealth of the Northern States is many times that of the Southern States, and "thereby hangs a tale" that explains it all. If you will put Carnegie and Havemeyer and others on the witness stand and probe them for the truth—ask them who created their wealth; ask them how much of the tariff steal they gave their employees; ask them why they can build mansions on the Scottish lakes while their employees can not provide huts in the mountains of Pennsylvania; ask them why before Dingleyism their laborers received 11 per cent more of the wealth created by their labor than now—ask these questions, and if truthful answers are given the theory that protection is the friend of labor will be forever damned. One must be an imbecile who fails to observe that if protection is intended for the laboring man he has been woefully robbed.

The millions being spent subsidizing libraries and buying passports to heaven are largely the legitimate fruits of the sweat and blood of labor. Now, sir, if your party is indeed and in truth the real friend of labor, why do you not devise some means to pre-

vent this bounty of protection from being stolen by the millionaires while in transit to the laborers? I dare say that if you will give to the half million striking miners even one-half the 60 cents a ton bounty on coal that they will return to work and strike no more.

When England abandoned protection, the wages of her laborers increased 40 per cent in a few years, says John Bright. Another said, "the laboring people of Great Britain are 30 per cent better fed, 40 per cent better clothed, 50 per cent better housed, and 100 per cent better educated than when England had a protective tariff." This is easily explained. When she opened her doors to the world, she at once became the world's greatest seller, and the demand for her products increased far more rapidly than she could supply them. Hence there was a greater demand for labor and higher wages followed. This would inevitably be the result in America were protection abandoned. We have a growing surplus of almost everything, and it must be apparent to everyone that as it increases the demand for and price of labor will decrease. Our congested home market is oversupplied with the fruits of labor. We need a wider market. There are twenty-five persons beyond the sea to consume our products where there is but one at home. Open the barred doors of the world by unlocking our own, and the increasing demand for our products will take care of three laborers while protection half starves one. [Applause.]

Sir, it must be apparent to every observer that trust-breeding protection, instead of building up, is destructive to the home market of the farmer. The trusts not only fix the price of the manufactured article, but of the raw material also. The prices for a year ahead is already fixed on his tobacco, cattle, hogs, sheep, hemp, poultry, hide, and many other products. They fix the prices and the farmer must submit. The great staples—cotton and grain—being dependent on a foreign market for consumption, are beyond the price-fixing power of the trust, and consequently have been higher than for years. Listen to the reading of a few lines from a well-known writer about the character of market protection and the beef trust as given the western farmers:

Being now the only buyer of cattle and the only seller of meat, the trust began a series of thoughtful operations that have reached from every farmer to every dinner table and taken tribute all the way. It put down the average price of medium cattle from \$6 a hundred-weight in September, 1899, to \$4.50 in March, 1904, and in the same period it put up the retail prices of dressed meat about 20 per cent. It raked off profits at every stage of the decline of the price of cattle and at every stage of the ascent of the price of meat. It advanced the prices of its fertilizer and offal products. It reached the producer and it raked the consumer and stood resolutely between them, gathering toll from each. It advanced day by day further into the field of production and day by day laid hold upon new victims. It disclosed gradually a gigantic plan to control the price of every edible thing grown in this country, and to control it for its own dividends.

Let me here read you a table showing the manner in which the trust has advanced the price of meat to the 3,000,000 of people in New York City since 1900:

Article.	October 21, 1900.	April 28, 1905.
Porterhouse steak.....per pound..	\$0.20	\$0.28
Sirloin steak.....do.....	.16	.24
Chuck steak.....do.....	.08	.12
Prime rib roast.....do.....	.18	.24
Veal cutlets.....do.....	.18	.25
Leg of mutton.....do.....	.10	.14
Soup meat.....do.....	.08	.12
Ham, best grade.....do.....	.12	.18
Bacon, canned, rindless.....do.....	.20	.28

Now, on the other hand, let me show you from the following table that the farmers' steers have not increased in price in Chicago since 1899. It is taken from the Weekly Live Stock Report:

Yearly average.	1,350 to 1,500 pounds.	1,200 to 1,350 pounds.	1,050 to 1,200 pounds.
1905.....	\$5.50	\$5.05	\$4.55
1904.....	5.45	4.95	4.45
1903.....	5.05	4.80	4.45
1902.....	6.80	6.25	5.65
1901.....	5.65	5.25	4.85
1900.....	5.40	5.15	4.90
1899.....	5.55	5.25	4.95

If the home-market theory of protection is true, then we have stopped far short of the good that might be derived by extending this doctrine to the States, and even down to the counties. Why not let each State provide a home market by passing a Dingley law? But what would become of New England if the other States were to enact a Dingley law against her products, or what would Pennsylvania do if they were to invoke the same

protection she demands for her iron and steel? Texas has oil field enough to bring her fabulous riches if permitted to erect a Dingley schedule against the Standard Oil trust. Your party cries out for an open market with all the States, yet denies the same privilege with all the world. If the freedom of commerce between the States is the correct economic policy, then as a logical conclusion it follows that a similar policy with all the consuming nations of the earth is the correct one, and especially is this true since we have much to sell and little to buy.

But, sir, the most fallacious reason yet offered in defense of protection is that it brought the unparalleled prosperity that has swept over many sections of the country for the past five or six years. If this is true, why have the unprotected sections been the more prosperous, and why has this benediction not reached us long ago? Have we not had this policy for forty-five years, and have we not during that time realized the most destructive panics?

We have heard some labored speeches try to assimilate protection and prosperity, but their logic is not above the philosophy of a Mississippi dinky, who believes the world is flat and does not extend beyond the limits of his vision. Every intelligent man well knows that existing prosperity is not limited to any section or any country. It is sweeping over the world. No such business activity has hitherto been known in Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Cape Colony, Germany, and many other European countries. Indeed, other countries have in many respects within the last few years been even more prosperous than the United States. Land values in Canada and parts of Mexico have since 1900 doubled in value; and exports, which are always a sure index to a nation's prosperity, have increased far more in many other countries than in the United States. Here is a table from a report of the Commerce and Labor Department, showing the increase of exports by nations since 1896:

	Per cent.
United States	88
Japan	173
Argentina	159
Mexico	122
Bulgaria	116
Cape of Good Hope	89
Norway	87
British India	82
Australia	78
Canada	76
Egypt	74

Now, we know that the defenders of protection have the assumption of an Egyptian god, but I hardly think they will have the temerity to contend that beneficent effects of Dingleyism has showered wealth on far-away Argentina, in the Cape of Good Hope, or in the far-away Australia. I know the Republican party can murder heathens by the "six hundred," or almost repeal the Lord's Prayer, under the iron-clad rules of this House, but I do not think they can compass the world's prosperity with their policy. Nor do I think they can expand its virtues so as to make it the cause of England, Japan, and Russia buying war supplies from the granaries of the West, or to make it the reason for the price of cotton advancing in Liverpool, wheat in London, and meat at Hamburg. No, Mr. Chairman, the present wave of prosperity is but the same as that which has swept over the greater part of the world during the past few years. Other countries, being prosperous, have consumed millions of dollars more of our products in the last few years than ever before, and we have prospered. The \$800,000,000 of cotton and food products we are annually sending the prosperous world, and not Dingleyism, is booming this country. "All the gold mineral in the world in the last four hundred years could not purchase the farm crops of the last two years," recently wrote a great man, and if all obstructions are removed from our foreign markets the farm will continue to take care of our national wealth. The real cause of this world-wide prosperity is difficult to explain, unless it be attributed to the unprecedented increase in gold production and to the immense amount expended by England, Japan, and Russia in recent wars.

Every dollar that is dug out of the earth not only intensifies business, but adds that much additional wealth to the world, and every dollar spent in war naturally drifts to those countries having the sinews of war. England in the Boer war expended about \$775,000,000, and Japan and Russia each far more than this amount, which largely drifted to the producing nations, and, too, there has been an unprecedented acceleration in the production of gold in the last decade. Since 1850 the world's annual production of this metal has increased from \$16,000,000 to \$375,000,000. Since 1897 the amount has increased from \$128,000,000, as is shown by the following table from the New York Herald:

1897	\$237,504,800
1898	286,879,700
1899	306,724,100
1900	254,576,300
1901	260,992,900
1902	296,048,800
1903	325,527,200
1904	347,150,700
1905 (estimated)	375,000,000

Mr. Chairman, it must be the irresistible judgment of every impartial observer that the existing policy of protection is not only without a virtue, but is a menace to that justice and equality involved in the spirit of the Constitution, and is rapidly breeding the leprosy of national deterioration. It is the verdict of universal history that wealth gives strength to a nation only when distributed with approximate equality among its subjects. Extreme poverty and massive riches alike breed the germs of national disease. Paupers and millionaires do not affiliate. One gravitates to the hovels of ignorance and anarchy and the other to the palaces of debauchery and moral death. One wields the sword of death-dealing vengeance, the other plunders with insatiable rapacity, and alike they murder patriotism. If seductive gold could have stayed the arrows of national decay, the story of liberty's tragic death would not have been embalmed in the ruins of Athens and Greece. In the golden age of Pericles, Athens has been described as being a statue with a "head of gold and feet of clay"—typical of the fact that her segregated aristocracy owned the realm with all of its villas and broad acres, while the common citizens were left to compete with slaves for bread. One surrendered the fruits of toil to physical masters and the other to industrial lords. Aristotle said that "Greek slaves were living machines which a man possesses," and some modern writer has defined an industrial slave as being "one the fruits of whose labor belongs to another." They are the successive footprints on the sands of social dissolution, and brought destruction to Greece in spite of her gold or her brilliant philosophy.

It has been said that the "rise of the Cæsars was the fall of Rome," but it should be remembered that when the patriot Brutus was staining his soul with the blood of the tyrant, three-fourths of the people were being fed from the public granaries and the remainder were debauching in fabulous wealth. According to the record left by the tribune Phillipus, only 2,000 men in Rome owned anything. One of these boasted that he had more money than three kings. Another paid \$18,000,000 to the Pretorian Guard to wear the Imperial Purple, and seven others purchased the entire Province of Africa. Under this mingled avalanche of pauperism and greed the world's most splendid civilization perished forever.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Does the gentleman think the tariff had anything to do with it?

Mr. BYRD. Not a thing. The price of cotton is one thing that the tariff does not affect, except to contract its market.

How ominously suggestive is the tragedy of this dead nation when viewed in the light of our industrial conditions. Less than a score of men own or control all the railroads and coal fields of half the nation. In 1900 our total wealth was estimated at \$90,000,000,000, and Doctor Spahr, in a creditable work on the subject, says that "1 per cent of the families own more of this vast amount than the other 99 per cent, and that one-eighth of the families own seven-eighths of the total amount." Rockefeller, Morgan, and many others could each buy one or more States of the Union, and I dare say would, if offered for sale. But in the shadow of this regal splendor we find lurking the most galling poverty. Many of our crowded industrial centers are the hotbeds of pauperism, vice, and socialism. "In a judicial district in this city there have been more evictions within the last three months than have occurred in the whole of Ireland during the same period," said a New York paper recently. "Hard by the palaces of the nabobs, women and children are being driven to suicide by poverty," says a late writer. Listen to the reading of this about the condition of the poor in New York:

Inspector H. M. Lechstrecker, of the State board of charities, on investigating, reported that out of 10,707 school children only 1,855 or less than one-fifth, began the day's work with adequate breakfast. Over 1,000 children never had for their morning meal more than bread only or coffee only, and nearly 500 came without any breakfast at all. The Salvation Army at once opened food stations for school children, and actually has close to a thousand every morning in attendance.

How does this horrible disclosure impress the minds of the defenders of the beef trust? Let others think as they may, but I had rather die a pauper and slumber in potter's field than to be the prince of a trust withholding food from the starving children of the land. [Applause.]

But one other thought in this connection. The returns of the



last election show that socialism is increasing in the United States with alarming rapidity, more so than in any other country. It recently invaded the sacred precincts of a western court and, putting law and justice to flight, acquitted one of the blackest self-confessed criminals of the age. The castles of the millionaires are being guarded by walking battalions, and even the tombs of the dead nabobs are watched by armed sentinels to drive away the socialistic ghouls who seek their dead bodies for ransom.

Mr. Chairman, we can not refrain from pronouncing this system of taxation for private greed as the most stupendous instrument of corruption ever tolerated by any government. Nor was there ever known a more insidious "disguise of disinterested patriotism" than that inspiring the conduct of those who now seek its perpetuation. In unmitigated viciousness it stands without a precedent, without a parallel, and without approval, either by the laws of God or humanity. In my humble judgment protected trusts, in iniquitous comparison with other evils that infest nations, rise like the rugged cliffs of a mountain above the surrounding hillocks. Not only do they beget poverty with its attendant vices and crimes, but they paralyze national effort and supplant patriotism by that cringing cowardice common to all people after long submission to public wrong. Foreign invasion, treason, or rebellion are to be preferred. They sweep like "visions of sorrow" across the national horizon, but when their transient race is run, renewed hope and invigorated patriotism urge the people to more exalted triumphs. They may leave in their wake death and hideous ruin, but they do not "killeth the soul" of a nation like these monsters of avaricious greed.

Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay;  
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;  
A breath can make them, as a breath has made;  
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
When once destroyed can never be supplied.

[Applause.]

Sir, the history of your party is an unending repetition of political crimes. It impoverished a great section by the tyranny of reconstruction; it exploited the Credit Mobilier and star-route frauds; it gave to railroad corporations enough of the public domain to make a State as large as Mississippi; it stole the Chief Magistracy of the nation once and has purchased it many times since; but of all its iniquities the blackest and most wicked is the holding up of our 80,000,000 people for the trusts to "rifle" their pockets. Such an act is as cruel and wicked as the tyranny of that ancient despot who rejoiced while burning the homes of his defenseless subjects.

Why longer continue such a policy? The hour for its destruction is at hand. It serves no purpose but usurpation and blesses none but the blessed; the poor it robs of food and the more fortunate of their bounty; it means death to legitimate industry and pauperism to labor; it bars our markets and rots the wealth of the farm. Its scanty virtues have been lost in its prostitution and its vices are supreme on the throne of avarice.

It sits as the arbiter of dishonesty, dividing the earnings of millions with the ghouls of greed. It awards them one-third of the salary of every servant of the Government, from the commanding general in the field to the janitor of this House; it gives the beef trust a full share of the pennies spent by the widow for a soup bone for her starving children; for the trusts it coins into shekles of gold the sweat and brawn of the toiling farmer, and drives his promising boy from the schoolroom to the plowshare. All classes—the weak, the strong, the Indian, the son of Ham, the Caucasian—are embraced within its insidious folds.

If this policy is to continue, we should erect a monument to departed justice and forever commit to the flames that sacred parchment bearing the insignia of equality of right among men; and we should further publish to the world that this nation is rapidly drifting to the goal of all former republics, and that the last and greatest example of self-government will soon perish—the victim of avarice.

Though why should we despair? Rather should we not rejoice to know that this wrong has reached the climax of its infamy, while the people are yet strong in patriotic virtue. There is a deep, resistless wave of political resentment rolling across the continent, that will not break until enthroned greed is swept from its anchorage into oblivion. The shepherds of the people are patiently keeping the night watch for the star that will guide them to the Bethlehem of a true leader, under whose banner they can march to victory and to liberty. May every Pharisee of greed soon cry out:

The thorns which I have reaped are of the tree  
I planted; they have torn me, and I bleed.  
I should have known what fruit would spring from such a seed.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. OVERSTREET. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] think that we had better rise at this time?

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. I wish the gentleman from Indiana would let us put in another speaker for about ten minutes and then rise.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, I thought, in view of the insistence of the other side last night to rise at 5 o'clock, that it would be well to do so now.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. The gentleman from Arkansas desires the floor for an hour.

Mr. MACON. I desire to state to the gentleman from Indiana that the gentleman from Tennessee has agreed to recognize me at this time for one hour, and if the gentleman will allow me to take the floor at this time that I may be recognized to proceed in the morning, I will then yield in order that the committee may now rise.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Well, I feel that inasmuch as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] began the debate to-day immediately after the reading of the Journal, it would be only fair for this side to have control of that hour to-morrow.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. My intention was to give the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Macon] one hour, let him proceed for a minute or so and then let the committee rise, and have him continue to-morrow morning. I know we are ahead of the gentleman on this side in point of time. If the gentleman desires to use an hour of his time now, I shall not yield to the gentleman from Arkansas until after that hour has been consumed to-morrow.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I suggest that it would be better practice if this side of the Chamber might consume the first hour upon meeting to-morrow.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee. Very well. Then I shall, with that understanding, yield to the gentleman from Arkansas after that hour has been consumed by the gentleman's side to-morrow.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the post-office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12286. An act granting relief to the estate of James Staley, deceased.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 5215. An act to fix the regular terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States for the southern division of the northern district of Alabama, and for other purposes; and

S. 87. An act providing for the withdrawal from public entry of lands needed for town-site purposes in connection with irrigation projects under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 7144. An act for the relief of Aaron Everly;  
H. R. 2202. An act granting a pension to Ellen Harriman;  
H. R. 3541. An act granting a pension to Dora A. Weathersby;

H. R. 3806. An act granting a pension to Eva L. Martin;  
H. R. 4261. An act granting a pension to A. Louisa S. McWhinnie;

H. R. 4593. An act granting a pension to William C. Short;  
H. R. 5485. An act granting a pension to Horace D. Mann;  
H. R. 5486. An act granting a pension to Margaret Carroll;  
H. R. 6147. An act granting a pension to Maud O. Worth;  
H. R. 7839. An act granting a pension to Ray E. Kline;  
H. R. 8339. An act granting a pension to Vienna Ward;  
H. R. 9705. An act granting a pension to George W. Robinson;

H. R. 10785. An act granting a pension to Thomas J. Chambers;

H. R. 11214. An act granting a pension to Isaac Baker;  
H. R. 11873. An act granting a pension to Joseph B. Fonner, alias John Havens;

H. R. 12403. An act granting a pension to Lydia A. Fiedler;  
H. R. 12656. An act granting a pension to Louise Ackley;

H. R. 13527. An act granting a pension to Willard V. Shepherd;  
 H. R. 14092. An act granting a pension to Frances Coyner;  
 H. R. 14098. An act granting a pension to Mary Winfrey;  
 H. R. 14642. An act granting a pension to James P. Himes;  
 H. R. 14768. An act granting a pension to Orlando W. Frazier;  
 H. R. 15449. An act granting a pension to Rhoda Kennedy;  
 H. R. 15870. An act granting a pension to Mary Palmer;  
 H. R. 15941. An act granting a pension to Lydia A. Keller;  
 H. R. 533. An act granting an increase of pension to Sumner F. Hunnewell;  
 H. R. 552. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Nortrip;  
 H. R. 1027. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Friend;  
 H. R. 1241. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Wallace;  
 H. R. 1322. An act granting an increase of pension to Katherine F. Wainwright;  
 H. R. 1468. An act granting an increase of pension to Morris B. Drake;  
 H. R. 1655. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Wheeler;  
 H. R. 1897. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Duncan;  
 H. R. 1913. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Conley;  
 H. R. 2082. An act granting an increase of pension to Siatha Bennett;  
 H. R. 2090. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Brant;  
 H. R. 2195. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Sawyer;  
 H. R. 2267. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rupert;  
 H. R. 2341. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen H. Hulbert;  
 H. R. 2396. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Hull;  
 H. R. 2640. An act granting an increase of pension to Decatur Harmon;  
 H. R. 2697. An act granting an increase of pension to Rufus G. Childress;  
 H. R. 2765. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Benson;  
 H. R. 2780. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Fifield;  
 H. R. 2984. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Gildersleeve;  
 H. R. 3007. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Carder;  
 H. R. 3197. An act granting an increase of pension to Milo G. Gibson;  
 H. R. 3233. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucius R. Simons;  
 H. R. 3281. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Underwood;  
 H. R. 3344. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Sanborn;  
 H. R. 3484. An act granting an increase of pension to Edson J. Harrison;  
 H. R. 3660. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Hill;  
 H. R. 3978. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Greenlee;  
 H. R. 4209. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Callahan;  
 H. R. 4352. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wolcott;  
 H. R. 4598. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Barry;  
 H. R. 4691. An act granting an increase of pension to George L. Janney;  
 H. R. 4717. An act granting an increase of pension to Marshall U. Gage;  
 H. R. 4766. An act granting an increase of pension to John Deardourff;  
 H. R. 4809. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Hatfield;  
 H. R. 4888. An act granting an increase of pension to William Moore;  
 H. R. 4946. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Lewis;  
 H. R. 5252. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Howard;

H. R. 5434. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh Green;  
 H. R. 5725. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Davis;  
 H. R. 5726. An act granting an increase of pension to Cate E. Cobb;  
 H. R. 5933. An act granting an increase of pension to Winnie C. Pittenger;  
 H. R. 6058. An act granting an increase of pension to Emilie Scheldt;  
 H. R. 6110. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram W. Davenport;  
 H. R. 6128. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Patterson;  
 H. R. 6142. An act granting an increase of pension to David Davis;  
 H. R. 6407. An act granting an increase of pension to William Blair;  
 H. R. 6465. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustus Joy;  
 H. R. 6557. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jasper;  
 H. R. 6775. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Lincoln;  
 H. R. 6888. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Hannah;  
 H. R. 6946. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Claunch;  
 H. R. 7225. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary O. Arnold;  
 H. R. 7331. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Porter;  
 H. R. 7515. An act granting an increase of pension to Firman F. Kirk;  
 H. R. 7585. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Girdler;  
 H. R. 7609. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Henderson;  
 H. R. 7681. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Miller;  
 H. R. 7738. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin J. Keck;  
 H. R. 7806. An act granting an increase of pension to Johanna Walgwist;  
 H. R. 7823. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Peters;  
 H. R. 7856. An act granting an increase of pension to Norman C. Potter;  
 H. R. 7951. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Pitchford;  
 H. R. 8042. An act granting an increase of pension to Bottol Larsen;  
 H. R. 8062. An act granting an increase of pension to John K. Miller;  
 H. R. 8206. An act granting an increase of pension to Carner C. Welch;  
 H. R. 8315. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Cannedy;  
 H. R. 8316. An act granting an increase of pension to William Smith;  
 H. R. 8328. An act granting an increase of pension to Ira Grabill;  
 H. R. 8333. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Honeywell;  
 H. R. 8530. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Q. Ward;  
 H. R. 8565. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew La Forge;  
 H. R. 8578. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin G. Mattern;  
 H. R. 8665. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram Long;  
 H. R. 8725. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses B. Davis;  
 H. R. 8823. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Briant;  
 H. R. 8930. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Becker;  
 H. R. 8942. An act granting an increase of pension to Marquis L. Johnson;  
 H. R. 9053. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Jones;  
 H. R. 9087. An act granting an increase of pension to William Winn;



- H. R. 9093. An act granting an increase of pension to Farrie M. Allis;  
 H. R. 9126. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan Parish;  
 H. R. 9296. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth D. Hopkin;  
 H. R. 9406. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis W. Preston;  
 H. R. 9617. An act granting an increase of pension to David A. Kirk;  
 H. R. 9839. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Siler;  
 H. R. 9896. An act granting an increase of pension to William McKenzie;  
 H. R. 9898. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham H. Miller;  
 H. R. 9904. An act granting an increase of pension to Neeta H. Marquis;  
 H. R. 9995. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Johnson;  
 H. R. 10019. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Shook;  
 H. R. 10230. An act granting an increase of pension to Clark A. Winans;  
 H. R. 10252. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Vincent;  
 H. R. 10293. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Galbraith;  
 H. R. 10300. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Sackett;  
 H. R. 10326. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmund Chapman;  
 H. R. 10396. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Malone;  
 H. R. 10404. An act granting an increase of pension to John Moules;  
 H. R. 10448. An act granting an increase of pension to George M. Frazer;  
 H. R. 10450. An act granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Ballard;  
 H. R. 10490. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucius A. West;  
 H. R. 10562. An act granting an increase of pension to Alphenis M. Beall;  
 H. R. 10594. An act granting an increase of pension to James Martin;  
 H. R. 10622. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Ward;  
 H. R. 10753. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Keller;  
 H. R. 10816. An act granting an increase of pension to August Bauer;  
 H. R. 10879. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Myers;  
 H. R. 10900. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur R. Dreppard;  
 H. R. 10907. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Boyd;  
 H. R. 10923. An act granting an increase of pension to Matilda Rockwell;  
 H. R. 11209. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Griffith;  
 H. R. 11509. An act granting an increase of pension to Josephine Hoornbeck;  
 H. R. 11638. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Vivian;  
 H. R. 11690. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis Lowry;  
 H. R. 11691. An act granting an increase of pension to John Clark;  
 H. R. 11905. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Atkinson;  
 H. R. 11990. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Coffman;  
 H. R. 12014. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Frasier;  
 H. R. 12393. An act granting an increase of pension to William Hardy;  
 H. R. 12417. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel G. Raymond;  
 H. R. 12443. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Southard;  
 H. R. 12455. An act granting an increase of pension to John Jacoby;  
 H. R. 12540. An act granting an increase of pension to Morris J. James;  
 H. R. 12541. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward V. Miles;  
 H. R. 12578. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Craig;  
 H. R. 12584. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Gulon;  
 H. R. 12643. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Franklin;  
 H. R. 12760. An act granting an increase of pension to William Ralston;  
 H. R. 12795. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Stimon;  
 H. R. 12825. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bloomer;  
 H. R. 12834. An act granting an increase of pension to Theodor Schramm;  
 H. R. 12880. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Mason;  
 H. R. 12897. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Malone;  
 H. R. 12900. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Havens;  
 H. R. 13005. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Wilson;  
 H. R. 13028. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bennett;  
 H. R. 13034. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hildenbrand;  
 H. R. 13038. An act granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Ramsey;  
 H. R. 13081. An act granting an increase of pension to Orren R. Smith;  
 H. R. 13082. An act granting an increase of pension to Herbert Williams;  
 H. R. 13083. An act granting an increase of pension to Mordecai B. Barbee;  
 H. R. 13136. An act granting an increase of pension to William Gaynor;  
 H. R. 13138. An act granting an increase of pension to Eada Lowry;  
 H. R. 13148. An act granting an increase of pension to William Davis;  
 H. R. 13150. An act granting an increase of pension to Cate F. Galbraith;  
 H. R. 13198. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah F. Allen;  
 H. R. 13230. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Webb;  
 H. R. 13231. An act granting an increase of pension to Gatsy Mattucks;  
 H. R. 13238. An act granting an increase of pension to William Strasburg;  
 H. R. 13310. An act granting an increase of pension to James McKee;  
 H. R. 13311. An act granting an increase of pension to John Wilkinson;  
 H. R. 13341. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Pate;  
 H. R. 13417. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Bookman;  
 H. R. 13502. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Buchanan;  
 H. R. 13505. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Chambers;  
 H. R. 13525. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Hensley;  
 H. R. 13584. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Jefferis;  
 H. R. 13587. An act granting an increase of pension to August Frahm;  
 H. R. 13597. An act granting an increase of pension to Abram J. Bozarth;  
 H. R. 13610. An act granting an increase of pension to James Hann;  
 H. R. 13627. An act granting an increase of pension to Homer F. Herriman, alias George F. Wilson;  
 H. R. 13697. An act granting an increase of pension to William Shoemaker;  
 H. R. 13710. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Wilson;  
 H. R. 13712. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline D. Scudder;

H. R. 13761. An act granting an increase of pension to John Cook;  
 H. R. 13798. An act granting an increase of pension to Alida King;  
 H. R. 13826. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Pettingill;  
 H. R. 13872. An act granting an increase of pension to Alvin D. Hopper;  
 H. R. 13891. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh G. Wilson;  
 H. R. 13959. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Mouser;  
 H. R. 13988. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary McMahon;  
 H. R. 13994. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Barkis;  
 H. R. 14076. An act granting an increase of pension to William Sanders;  
 H. R. 14077. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Chasebro;  
 H. R. 14078. An act granting an increase of pension to Catherine Summers;  
 H. R. 14086. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Pence;  
 H. R. 14089. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Harter;  
 H. R. 14112. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Baker;  
 H. R. 14113. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Perry;  
 H. R. 14140. An act granting an increase of pension to Josephine M. Cage;  
 H. R. 14258. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Miles;  
 H. R. 14277. An act granting an increase of pension to George S. Scott;  
 H. R. 14287. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha Brooks;  
 H. R. 14327. An act granting an increase of pension to Amelia Nichols;  
 H. R. 14367. An act granting an increase of pension to Lemuel O. Gilman;  
 H. R. 14369. An act granting an increase of pension to Sumner P. Wyman;  
 H. R. 14389. An act granting an increase of pension to Amos Hart;  
 H. R. 14425. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Henderson Griffin;  
 H. R. 14426. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Menefee;  
 H. R. 14538. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza L. Norwood;  
 H. R. 14563. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin L. Higgins;  
 H. R. 14639. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Merrill;  
 H. R. 14646. An act granting an increase of pension to Ambrose R. Fisher;  
 H. R. 14653. An act granting an increase of pension to Sophronia Lofton;  
 H. R. 14655. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Gilham;  
 H. R. 14669. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna H. Wagner;  
 H. R. 14694. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel R. Dummer;  
 H. R. 14748. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Burks;  
 H. R. 14761. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Decker;  
 H. R. 14793. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Howell;  
 H. R. 14834. An act granting an increase of pension to Ruth J. McCann;  
 H. R. 14840. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel H. Rone;  
 H. R. 14848. An act granting an increase of pension to Samantha E. Herald;  
 H. R. 14878. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Rattray;  
 H. R. 14888. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Bunker;  
 H. R. 14890. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Posey;

H. R. 14925. An act granting an increase of pension to James Grizzle;  
 H. R. 14937. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Nagle;  
 H. R. 14988. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Cox;  
 H. R. 15062. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sparrow;  
 H. R. 15199. An act granting an increase of pension to John T. Cook;  
 H. R. 15249. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Seal; and  
 H. R. 15276. An act granting an increase of pension to Wesley Smith.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 5438. An act to establish a light and fog signal in New York Bay at the entrance to the dredged channel at Greenville, N. J.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.  
 S. 1165. An act granting an increase of pension to James Moss—to the Committee on Pensions.  
 S. 2115. An act granting a pension to Carrie E. Costinett—to the Committee on Pensions.  
 S. 1308. An act granting an increase of pension to Emilie Grace Reich—to the Committee on Pensions.  
 S. 4834. An act granting an increase of pension to Octave Counter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 1376. An act granting a pension to Adam Werner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 2378. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria Leuckart—to the Committee on Pensions.  
 S. 1398. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmund Morgan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4826. An act granting a pension to Sarah Agnes Earl—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4675. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie P. Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4650. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4309. An act granting an increase of pension to Adele Jeanette Hughes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4972. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Hull—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 2733. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Crismon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 1975. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Dugger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4300. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Dunn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.  
 S. 4467. An act removing the charge of desertion from the military record of James B. Boyd—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. OVERSTREET (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock m.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17662) to authorize the Tyronza Central Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Little River, in the State of Arkansas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2942); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4170) to amend an act approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for prior years, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2944); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R.



15071) to provide means for the sale of internal-revenue stamps in the island of Porto Rico, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2945); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OLCOTT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17217) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," regulating proceedings for condemnation of land for streets, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2946); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORRELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1243) providing for compulsory education in the District of Columbia, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2947); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4302) to amend the provision in an act approved March 3, 1899, imposing a charge for tuition on non-resident pupils in the public schools of the District of Columbia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2948); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred bills of the House H. R. 375, 4462, and 5974, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia; accompanied by a report (No. 2949); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5290) providing for the allotment and distribution of Indian tribal funds, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2950); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17756) to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within the Black Hills Forest Reserve, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2951); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6864) granting an increase of pension to Henry Good, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2908); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7737) granting a pension to William H. Winters, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2909); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8226) granting a pension to Laura B. Ihrie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2910); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to R. L. Davis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2911); which said bill and report were referred to the Senate Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12561) granting a pension to Francis M. McClendon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2912); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13421) granting a pension to John W. Wabass, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2913); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13575) granting a pension to Frances Bell, reported the same with amendment, accom-

panied by a report (No. 2914); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14745) granting an increase of pension to Frederick B. Walton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2915); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14955) granting a pension to Eliza Moore, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2916); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15366) granting a pension to Elvia Lane, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2917); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOGG, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15855) granting a pension to Will E. Kayser, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2918); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16224) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Crawford, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2919); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16466) granting an increase of pension to Asenith Woodall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2920); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16527) granting an increase of pension to William Martin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2921); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16529) granting an increase of pension to James M. Sykes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2922); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16576) granting an increase of pension to Silas P. Conway, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2923); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16577) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Pound, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2924); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOGG, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16681) granting a pension to Gustave Bergen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2925); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16902) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Winn, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2926); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16931) granting a pension to Cornelia Mitchell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2927); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17036) granting an increase of pension to Josephine L. Jordan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2928); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17067) granting an increase of pension to Simeon Pierce, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2929); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17151) granting a pension to William T. Morgan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2930); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was

referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17194) granting an increase of pension to Jennie White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2931); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17278) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Patterson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2932); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17310) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Hite, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2933); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17342) granting an increase of pension to Wesley G. Cox, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2934); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17372) granting an increase of pension to Arethusa M. Pettit, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2935); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17402) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah H. Hazlitt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2936); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17591) granting an increase of pension to William Hall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2937); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. McLAIN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17613) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Nash, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2938); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17619) granting an increase of pension to Davia D. Spain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2939); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. TYNDALL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2188) granting to the city of Durango, in the State of Colorado, certain lands therein described for water reservoirs, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2940); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Montana, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10292) granting to the town of Mancos, Colo., the right to enter certain lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2941); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KLINE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4376) to quitclaim all the interest of the United States of America in and to a certain lot of land lying in the District of Columbia and State of Maryland to heirs of John C. Rives, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2943); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 17833) providing for the administration of the operations of the act of Congress approved June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 17834) to amend section 764 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to appeals in petitions for habeas corpus—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 17835) concerning jurisdiction in judicial proceedings—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17836) to regulate practice as to instructing juries—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17837) providing for the assessment by jury of the punishment to be imposed upon conviction of crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia: A bill (H. R. 17838) to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 17839) providing for the appointment of a chaplain in the Life-Saving Service of the United States in the district including the coast of New Jersey—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 17840) regulating wages in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 17878) to incorporate the Rock River Navigation and Improvement Company, and to authorize the construction and maintenance of one or more dams across Rock River for the purpose of the improvement of the navigation thereof and to utilize the water power thereby created incidental to such construction—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 17879) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the carrying of dangerous articles on passenger steamers—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A resolution (H. Res. 392) asking the Secretary of the Interior for certain information concerning the Shawnee Training School, in Oklahoma—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A resolution (H. Res. 393) asking certain information of the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the accounts of the United States postal agent at Shanghai and the United States consul at Tientsin—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 17841) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Springsteel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 17842) granting a pension to Josephine Virginia Sparks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 17843) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Watkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17844) granting an increase of pension to Gordon McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17845) granting an increase of pension to John H. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17846) granting an increase of pension to B. C. Crosthwait—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 17847) granting an increase of pension to William H. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 17848) for the relief of Jesse W. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 17849) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Pierce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17850) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17851) granting an increase of pension to George S. Ramsey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17852) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 17853) granting a pension to Henry Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 17854) granting an increase of pension to John Eubanks—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLERBE: A bill (H. R. 17855) granting an increase of pension to Harriett E. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 17856) for the relief of U. G. Des Portes, administrator of the estate of S. S. Wolfe, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 17857) granting an increase of pension to John S. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 17858) to correct the military record of and grant to John B. Curtis an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILL: A bill (H. R. 17859) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Derr—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17860) granting a pension to Emeline K. Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 17861) granting a pension to Thomas D. Bearden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17862) granting an increase of pension to T. M. Youngblood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 17863) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Tarbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 17864) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 17865) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Arnott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 17866) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Edward W. Southworth and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 17867) for the relief of David Parrott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 17868) granting a pension to Burdene Blake—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17869) granting a pension to Joseph Snowden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 17870) for the relief of Harrison Dobbs—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17871) granting a pension to M. E. Garrettson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17872) granting an increase of pension to A. D. Metcalfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 17873) granting an increase of pension to Milo Bunce—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 17874) granting an increase of pension to Roseanna Hughes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 17875) waiving the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy in the case of W. W. Peirce—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TYNDALL: A bill (H. R. 17876) granting an increase of pension to John M. Rupert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 17877) granting an increase of pension to Emmagene Bronson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Rebecca J. Fisher (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of R. A. and J. J. Williams, Robert C. Lippincott, Howard L. Neff, Eli B. Hallowell & Co., Miller, Robinson & Co., Thomas B. Hammer, Edmund A. Souder & Co., and William L. Shew & Co.; for bill H. R. 5281 (the pilotage bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of McKees Rocks Division, No. 201, Order of Railway Conductors, against the Hepburn railway rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of the Keystone Watch Case Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., against bill H. R. 14604, relative to spuriously stamped articles of merchandise—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Sorosis Woman's Club of Union City, Pa., for forest reserves in the White Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Sorosis Woman's Club of Union City, Pa., for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Sorosis Woman's Club of Union City, Pa., for the Morris law (timber reservation in Minnesota)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. B. Hallowell, George F. Craig, William L. Shew & Co., R. A. & J. J. Williams, Thomas B. Hammer, Howard L. Neff, E. A. Souder & Co., and Miller, Robinson & Co., of

Philadelphia, Pa., for bill H. R. 5281—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Emerson Club, of Townsville, Pa., for investigation of the industrial condition of women in the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Virginia C. Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas J. Benton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Maggie Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Burnwell C. Crosthwait—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Gordon McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel Watkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John P. Simer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of David Ross—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Martin Spriggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Jasper Staten—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of dependent brother and sister of Isaac Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of Mystic Council, No. 10, Daughters of Liberty, of Newburgh, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Edmund A. Sonder & Co., William L. Shew & Co., Thomas B. Hammer, R. A. & J. J. Williams, Eli B. Hallowell & Co., Miller, Robinson & Co., Howard L. Neff, and Robert C. Lippincott, for bill H. R. 5281 (the pilotage bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of McKees Rocks Division, No. 201, Order of Railway Conductors, against the Hepburn railway rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of the American Federation of Labor, against bill H. R. 5281—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Morris—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of 20 attorneys of Clinton, Iowa, for passage of bill H. R. 16551—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Ulysses G. Des Portes, administrator of estate of Saling S. Wolf—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the advisory committee of 100, of New York, for battle-ship construction at the Brooklyn Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Petition of Cyclopean Towers Council, No. 87, of Mount Solon, Va., and Gilt Edge Council, No. 42, of Mount Sidney, Va., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Federation of Labor, against the pilotage bill (H. R. 5281)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Sandwich (Ill.) Manufacturing Company, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Fortnightly Club, of Genoa, Ill., for an appropriation for investigation of the industrial condition of women in the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of citizens of Ottawa, Ill., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 1037, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, against bill H. R. 12973, relative to Chinese immigration and for the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: Petition of Springfield (Mass.) Grange, officers and 475 members, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Burroughs Club, favoring bills H. R. 7019, 11949, and 11950, relative to the preservation of game in the Territories and the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Colonel F. M. Bayne Council, No. 103, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Emma Mabon, for relief of landless Indians of northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of many citizens of New York and vicinity, for relief for heirs of victims of *General Slocum* disaster—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petition of McKees Rocks Division, Order of Railway Conductors, against the Hepburn railway rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Miller, Robinson & Co., R. A. & J. J. Williams, Eli B. Hallowell & Co., Howard L. Neff, Thomas B. Hammer, Edmund A. Souder & Co., and William L. Shew & Co., for bill H. R. 5281 (pilotate)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GREENE: Petition of 303 citizens of the District of Columbia, for a law to correct defects in the present system of school instruction in the District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the Fortnightly Club, of San Jose, Cal., for investigation of the industrial condition of women in the United States—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the California Equal Suffrage Association, for bill S. 50 (Senator GALLINGER, regulation of child labor), bill H. R. 4462 (Mr. BABCOCK), and for bill S. 2962 (Senator CRANE, a children's bureau)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Palo Alto and Santa Clara County, Cal., for relief for Indians of California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HERMANN: Petition of citizens of Josephine County, Oreg., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of the American Federation of Labor, against bill H. R. 5281 (the pilotage bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Acacia, of Lincoln, Nebr., against the tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of Leyden (Mass.) Grange, for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of E. Bailey & Sons, W. H. Lundquist, the Benner Line of New York, and the John C. Orr Company, for bill H. R. 5281—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of Lincoln Bailey et al., for repeal of revenue tax on denaturized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary H. Blake et al., for relief of landless Indians in northern California—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles P. Coursey—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Washington Men's Council, No. 2, Norfolk, Va., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Hampton, Va., and Peninsula Council, No. 125, for the Penrose bill (S. 4357) for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOUSER: Petition of 800 citizens of Ohio, against sale of liquor in Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James West—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of citizens of Mount Kisco, N. Y., for relief of the California Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolution of Camp Merwin M. Carleton, indorsing the Bonyne bill, for medals for officers and enlisted men serving in the Philippines—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of St. Paul, Minn., against bill H. R. 7067—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, for reform in the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, for an amendment to the customs administrative act—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cone Export and Commission Company, against forgery of trade-marks—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of citizens of the Eighth Congressional district of Pennsylvania and members of the Church of the Seventh-Day Adventists, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Lansdale Council, No. 111, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Paper to accompany bill to place C. W. Geddes upon the retired list of the Navy as first assistant engineer—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petition of the Cumberland Glass Company, of Bridgeton, N. J., and the Rio Grande Canning Company, for bill S. 88, with an amendment as suggested by the House committee (the pure-food bill)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pride of Trenton Council, No. 46, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Henry & Wright Manufacturing Company and the Sipp Electric and Machine Company, against the Littauer bill (compulsory metric system)—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of Hightstown Council, No. 46, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Peapack, N. J.; W. O. George, of Trenton, N. J.; R. S. Tomlinson, of Mercerville, N. J.; John R. Patrey, of Gladstone, N. J., and citizens of Somerville, Hopewell, and Liberty Corner, N. J., for bill H. R. 15442 (the naturalization bill)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, April 7, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### DOUBLE TAXATION OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I called up the privileged bill (H. R. 16226) to amend the internal-revenue laws and to prevent the double taxation of certain distilled spirits, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That distilled spirits commonly known as "soakage," which exist in the staves or wood of any cask or package at the time of its withdrawal from a distillery or bonded warehouse, shall not be subject to any tax whatever after its withdrawal under or by virtue of the existing laws.

With the following amendment:

In line 7, after the word "laws," add "should such spirits at any time thereafter be recovered from the wood of such package by any process."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DALZELL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 12843. An act to amend the seventh section of the act entitled "An act to establish circuit courts of appeals and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested: